

Desh

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 2 1955

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

modern

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

language

VOL. LXX, NO. 5, MAY 1955

notes

- 315 Gower's *Vox Clamantis* and the *Speculum Stultorum*.
R. R. RAYMO
- 321 Chaucer's Gildsmen and Their Cook. PETER LISCA
- 324 Chaucer and the Holy Cross of Bromholm. R. A. PRATT
- 325 Some Notes on Vinaver's Malory. D. C. MUECKE
- 328 Grimald's *Christus Redivivus* and the Digby Resurrection Play.
PATRICIA ABEL
- 331 The *Eikon Basilike*: An Unreported Item in the Contemporary
Authorship Controversy. ERNEST SIRLUCK
- 332 Pope and Cibber's *The Non-Juror*. W. M. PETERSON
- 336 Smollett's Satire on the Hutchinsonians. E. R. WASSERMAN
- 337 Shaftesbury in Joseph Warton's *Enthusiast*. A. D. MCKILLOP
- 340 Cowper's *Connoisseur* Essays. ARTHUR SHERBO
- 342 Keats' Well Examined Urn. PORTER WILLIAMS, JR.
- 345 Hopkins's "wings that spell" in *The Wreck of the Deutschland*.
SISTER MARY ADORITA, B. V. M.
- 347 A Defense of the Ending of Cooper's *The Crater*. W. B. GATES
- 349 William Faulkner and Sir Philip Sidney? J. B. VICKERY
- 350 Heine's Poem "Ein Fräulein stand am Meere." ERNST FEISE
- 351 Voltaire and the Printer, Walther. F. J. CROWLEY
- 354 The Spanish Translations of Alciato's *Emblemata*. K. L. SELIG
- 360 A Latin Poem of Ariosto in Spanish. E. S. MORBY

REVIEWS

- 363 C. L. WRENN, ed., *Beowulf*, with the Finnesburg Fragment (J. R. HULBERT)
- 364 V. F. HOOPER, tr., *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (Selected) (GERMAINE DEMPSTER)
- 366 E. T. SEHRT, *Vergebung und Gnade bei Shakespeare* (O. J. CAMPBELL)
- 369 L. G. LOCKE, *Tillotson* (J. I. COPE)
- 373 CLARENCE TRACY, *The Artificial Bastard: Richard Savage* (J. L. CLIFFORD)
- 374 M. H. ABRAMS, *The Mirror and the Lamp* (A. S. P. WOODHOUSE)
- 378 KATHLEEN COBURN, ed., *The Letters of Sara Hutchinson* (G. W. MEYER)
- 379 JOSEPHINE BAUER, *The London Magazine, 1820-1829* (W. S. WARD)
- 381 N. C. STARR, *King Arthur Today* (ELLSWORTH BARNARD)
- 383 H. H. CLARK, ed., *Transitions in American Literary History* (R. E. SPILLER)
- 383 ROGER ASSELINEAU, *The Literary Reputation of Mark Twain from 1910 to 1950* (H. N. SMITH)
- 385 F. T. H. FLETCHER, *Pascal and the Mystical Tradition* (J.-J. DEMOREST)
- 387 SAMUEL ROGERS, *Balzac and the Novel* (J. C. MCLAREN)
- 388 MILMAN FARRY and ALBERT LORD, *Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs, et al.* (ARCHER TAYLOR)

modern language notes

KEMP MALONE,
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

ANNA HATCHER

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

GEORGES POULET

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

EARL R. WASSERMAN

S. K. HENINGER, JR.,
Secretary

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress of 16 July 1894.

VLOR)

through
s; \$6.25
e, \$1.00
should
18, Md.
uscripts
es, The
Every
d return
tors are

re, Md.
rate of
ongress

(ca)

ough

\$6.25

1.00

ould

Md.

cripts

The

Every

ctum

are

Md.

re of

gren,

modern language notes

VOL. LXX, NO. 5, MAY 1955

Gower's *Vox Clamantis* and the *Speculum Stultorum*

Among the works which John Gower freely plundered for his composition of the *Vox Clamantis* was Nigel de Longchamps' *Speculum Stultorum*, a late twelfth-century beast epic, whose vogue, never inconsiderable throughout the Middle Ages, reached its height in England between 1350 and 1450.¹ The *Speculum Stultorum* is the story of an ass called Burnell who, being discontent with his short but adequate tail, determines to acquire a longer one. After a series of discouraging adventures, he decides to found a new religious order based on ordinances which are a burlesque of those already in existence. Gower expressly alluded to this tale twice in the course of the *Vox Clamantis*. On the first occasion, beholding in a dream a band of people transformed by divine wrath into asses, he compared their foolish demands to be horses with the ridiculous desire of Burnell to acquire a longer tail:

Ut vetus ipse suam curtam Burnellus inepte
Caudam longari de novitate cupit,

¹ The *Vox Clamantis* has been edited by G. C. Macaulay (*The Complete Works of John Gower*, IV, Oxford, 1902, pp. 3-313); the *Speculum Stultorum* by Thomas Wright (*Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century*, Rolls Series, London, 1872, I, pp. 11-145). These works are herein referred to as *VC* and *SS*, respectively.

Sic iste miseri nova tergaque longa requirunt,
Ut leo de cauda sunt et asellus idem.²

On the second occasion, he lodged a complaint against the Friars for having abandoned their own rule in favor of that instituted by Burnell:

Sed sacer ordo tamen remanet, quem sanxerat olim
Frater Burnellus, crescit et illa magis.
Hec decreta modo, Burnellus que statuebat,
Omnia non resero nec reserare volo.

* * * * *
Mollibus ornatus sic dignior ordo novellus
Restat Burnelli, vult quia velle viri
Nil michi Bernardus, nichil ammodo seu Benedictus
Sint, set Burnellus sit prior ipse meus.³

More pertinent to our purpose than these random references, however, are the considerable number of lines and phrases which Gower appropriated *verbatim*, or nearly *verbatim*, from the *Speculum Stultorum*. The following is a list of all the borrowings I have found with the exception of a few already identified by Gower's learned editor, G. C. Macaulay⁴:

Personat omne nemus

(VC, I, 92 = SS, p. 28, l. 18)

Semper idem repetens . . . cuculus

(VC, I, 93-4 = SS, p. 28, ll. 23-4)

Pelle leonina tectum se pinxit asellus

Et sua transcendit gloria vana modum

(VC, I, 205-6 = SS, p. 13, ll. 1-2)

Cauda suo capiti quia se conferre nequibat

(VC, I, 207 = SS, p. 13, l. 23)

Quam tibi plantavit caudam qui contulit aures

(VC, I, 211 = SS, p. 15, l. 19)

Magnos magna decent

(VC, I, 217 = SS, p. 16, l. 11)

Sufficit ad potum

(VC, I, 364 = SS, p. 35, l. 20)

² VC, I, 201-4. SS was often called *Burnellus* or *Speculum Burnelli*, as can be seen from its MSS (e.g., Bodleian 761 and 851) and Chaucer's reference to it (NPT 3312).

³ VC, IV, 1189-92, 1207-10.

⁴ Macaulay identifies the following quotations from the SS: VC, I, 79 f., 205 ff., 213 f., 603, 615 f., 635, 637 f.; II, 15.

Per iuga, per colles, per devia queque locorum
Diruptis stabulis solvitur omne pecus

(VC, I, 511 = SS, p. 29, ll. 7-8)

Conveniunt musce, vespe glomerantur in unum,
Aera conturbant improbitate sua

(VC, I, 601-2 = SS, p. 30, ll. 3-4)

Torvus oester adest

(VC, I, 603 = SS, p. 29, l. 4)

Sine lege vagantes

(VC, I, 605 = SS, p. 29, l. 11)

Quas musce prius oppressit cana pruina gelu

(VC, I, 620 = SS, p. 24, l. 18)

Sic calor estatis subito fervore per agros

Spersit, yemps modica quas retinere solet

(VC, I, 621-2 = SS, p. 24, ll. 19-20)

Sordida musca

(VC, I, 628 = SS, p. 29, l. 6)

Hec erat illa dies, que sola tremenda per orbem

Tanquam iudicii plena timoris erat

(VC, I, 667-8 = SS, p. 25, ii. 5-6)

Hec erat illa dies, de qua, si vera fatemur

(VC, I, 669 = SS, p. 26, l. 3)

Nulla quies mentis lese nullumque iuvamen

Exstitit, ut sanus tempus habere queat

(VC, I, 1331 = SS, p. 56, ll. 11-12)

In sine scire parum multum solet esse pudori

(VC, II, 33 = SS, p. 50, l. 25)

Impetus evertit quicquid fortuna ministrat

Prospera, nec stabilem contulit ipsa statum

(VC, II, 193-4 = SS, p. 31, ll. 3-4)

Christus erat pauper

(VC, III, 11 = SS, p. 110, l. 7)

Bachus adest festo patulo diffusus in auro

(VC, III, 103 = SS, p. 57, l. 7)

Aula patet cunctis oneratque cibaria mensas

indulgetque nimis potibus atque cibis

(VC, III, 107-8 = SS, p. 57, ll. 3-4)

Que prosunt aliis, aliis nocuisse probantur

(VC, III, 503 = SS, p. 14, l. 25)

Bella gerant alii . . .

Quique tubis resonant, nos tacuisse decet.

Quo levius cessit cuiquam victoria belli,

Victoris tanto gloria maior erit

(VC, III, 508-10 = SS, p. 62, ll. 9-12)

Non opus est armis, ubi vox benedicta triumphat
(*VC*, III, 513 = *SS*, p. 62, l. 13)

O quam perduros habet impaciencia fines
Unde solet praeceps exitus esse gravis
(*VC*, III, 521 = *SS*, p. 21, ll. 1-2)

Quam variis vicibus humane res variantur
(*VC*, III, 535 = *SS*, p. 54, l. 25)

Quam minima causa magnum discrimen oriri
Possit, ab effectu res manifesta docet
(*VC*, III, 537 = *SS*, p. 54, ll. 27-8)

Rebus in adversis opus est moderamine multo
Nec decet in gravibus precipitare gradum
(*VC*, III, 539-40 = *SS*, p. 20, ll. 27-28)

Micius in duris sapiens Cato mandat agendum
(*VC*, III, 540 = *SS*, p. 21, l. 7)

Rebus in ambiguis quociens fortuna laborat
(*VC*, III, 543 = *SS*, p. 21, l. 1)

Extitit in letis minor et sollercia nobis
(*VC*, III, 551 = *SS*, p. 21, l. 23)

Casibus in letis magis est metuenda voluptas
(*VC*, III, 557 = *SS*, p. 21, l. 25)

Casibus in letis quam sit vicina ruina
Et lapsus facilis, nemo videre potest
(*VC*, III, 559-60 = *SS*, p. 40, ll. 15-16)

Non reputet modicum modico contenta voluntas,
Res de postfacto que fuit ante docet:
Nec magnum reputet quisquam, quin tempore quovis
Fortuito casu perdere possit idem.
Discant precipites et quos mora nulla retardat,
Ne nimis accelerent in sua dampna manus
(*VC*, III, 561-66 = *SS*, p. 27, ll. 23-28)

Exoptata diu dulcis medicina dolorum,
Sero licet veniat, grata venire solet
(*VC*, III, 1309 = *SS*, p. 62, ll. 1-2)

Qui nichil est per se, nec habet quo tendat in altum,
Expedi alterius ut relevetur ope;
Est tamen absurdum, cum quilibet ex alieno
Intumet ulterius quam tumuisse decet
(*VC*, III, 1371-74 = *SS*, p. 12, ll. 21-4)

Consuetudo tamen solet attenuare pudorem,
Reddit et audacem quem mors longa trahit
(*VC*, III, 1631-32 = *SS*, p. 12, ll. 27-8)

Sicque loquax digitus redimendo silencia verbi
(*VC*, IV, 173 = *SS*, p. 52, l. 1)

- Sit tibi potus aqua
(VC, IV, 501 = SS, p. 35, l. 1)
- Rem poterit fragilem frangere causa levis
(VC, IV, 614 = SS, p. 41, l. 14)
- Nil proprietatis habentes
(VC, IV, 721 = SS, p. 87, l. 29)
- Istos conversos set perversos magis esse
Constat, ut ex factis nomina vera trahant
(VC, IV, 747-8 = SS, p. 45, ll. 11-12)
- Ve cui stulta comes sociali federe nupsit
Non erit illius absque dolore thorus
(VC, V, 429-30 = SS, p. 58, ll. 1-2)
- Arma ferunt pacem
(VC, VI, 713 = SS, p. 30, l. 1)
- Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum
(VC, VI, 869 = SS, p. 145, ll. 13-16)
- Nobile corpus habes
(VC, VI, 1081 = SS, p. 17, l. 15)
- Discite quam prope sit et quam vicina ruina
(VC, VI, 371 = SS, p. 31, l. 1)
- Discite quam nichil est quicquid peritura voluptas
Possidet et false vendicat esse suum
(VC, VII, 373-74 = SS, p. 31, ll. 5-6)
- Hec mors non onere set plus conducit honori
(VC, VII, 1021 = SS, p. 30, l. 23)

In a few instances, Gower's indebtedness to the *Speculum Stultorum* falls between plagiarism and paraphrase:

- Error posterior pejor quandoque priore
Esse solet, vereor posteriora mea
(SS, p. 51, ll. 17-18)
- Dampna priora michi posteriora timent
(VC, I, 2076)
- Non tamen accelerans, ni cum pulsatur ad ollam
Ut solet ad mensam ventre docente viam
Sed pede spondaico gressu gradiens asinino,
Ut solet ad laudes nocte venire venit
(SS, p. 42, ll. 13-16)
- Accelerans currit cito, cum pulsatur ad ollam,
Preterit a mensa mica nec una sibi;
Set pede spondaico lentus de nocte resurgens,
Cum venit ad laudes, ultimus esse petit
(VC, IV, 79-82)

Nam puer impubes Cicerone disertior ipso
Fingitur, et magno scire Catone magis
(SS, p. 12, ll. 9-10)

Nunc puer impubes sapiencior est Citherone
Regis in aspectu, plusque Catone placet.
(VC, VII, 247-8)

It is apparent from the foregoing list that Gower was thoroughly familiar with the *Speculum Stultorum*. His quotations are drawn from every section of the work with the sole exception of that describing the experiences of Burnell's master, Bernard, with the ungrateful rich man, Dryanus.⁵ He was, however, familiar with this story, too, for some years later he based his own story of Adrian and Bardus in the *Confessio Amantis* upon it.⁶ To judge from the quantity of quotations, he seems to have been especially fond of the *exempla* of the revengeful cock—a favorite, it will be remembered, of Chaucer's—and of the unfortunate cows who were ruthlessly attacked by swarms of flies. Together, these tales supplied Gower with two-thirds of all his borrowings from the *Speculum Stultorum*. Few of his quotations, however, either from these or from other portions of the *Speculum Stultorum*, have any relation to their original context. Admittedly, where some correspondences of form and subject-matter occur between the two poems—as, for example, in their use of animals for satirical allegory, in their invectives against the contemporary orders of Church and State, or in their melancholy reflections on Fortune—Gower knew where to turn for a useful phrase, line or even passage. But, for the most part, he boldly made his borrowed matter suit his own purposes. It is characteristic of his method and indeed of his wit that the description in the *Speculum Stultorum* of Burnell's loss of the fragile jars containing the drugs necessary to lengthen his tail should in the *Vox Clamantis* become part of an exhortation to priests not to visit nuns too often:

Rem poterit fragilem frangere causa levis.
(VC, IV, 614 = SS, p. 41, l. 14)

University of California,
Los Angeles

ROBERT R. RAYMO

⁵ SS, pp. 134-44.

⁶ J. Gower, *Complete Works*, ed. Macaulay, III, pp. 81-7.

Chaucer's Gildsmen and Their Cook

Although the five gildsmen take very little space in the General Prologue and, except for their cook, do not appear again, their portrait is one of Chaucer's most incisive. It is a portrait done in the dry point of satire, with the burgeoning respectability of the *nouveau riche* in every sure stroke—their dress, their ambitions, their cook.

In contrast to the knight, who joins the pilgrimage in a "fustian . . . gypon/Al bismotered" (75-76), the gildsmen come in a "lyveree" which is "ful fressh and newe" (365), bought for the occasion.¹ Their knives, "chaped noght with bras/But al with silver" (366-367), must have occasioned hearty chuckles among the pilgrims, who knew that ordinary tradesmen and craftsmen were forbidden the use of precious metals for such ornamentation.²

While Chaucer remarks that

Everiche, for the wisdom that he kan,
Was shaply for to been an alderman. (371-372)

it is necessary to read this statement in conjunction with the next two lines to perceive the mordant irony:

For catel hadde they ynogh and rente,
And eek hir wyves wolde it wel assente. (373-374)

It is certainly doubtful that Chaucer considered property and a socially ambitious wife sufficient qualifications for a lawgiver, or that these really constitute "wisdom."³ This technique of the "modifying context" is used frequently in the General Prologue. Note how in the following passages it is not until the last line or two that the real meaning becomes clear:

In al the parisshe, wyf ne was ther noon
That to the offrynge bfore hir sholde goon;

¹ Citations from Chaucer in my text are to *The Complete Works*, ed. Fred N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

² Walter W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Vol. v, p. 36.

³ Mr. Ernest P. Kuhl, writing on "Chaucer's Burgesses" in *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, xvii (1916), 652-675, suggests that the passage is to be taken at its face value. In this he is supported by Miss Muriel Bowden, *A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1948), p. 184, and Mr. Nevill Coghill, *The Poet Chaucer* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1949), p. 116. Mr. Kemp Malone suggests that Chaucer regards the burgesses' "high standing, or at any rate their pretensions" as amusing, but does not specify Chaucer's grounds for amusement. See Kemp Malone, *Chapters On Chaucer* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1951), pp. 148-149.

And if ther dide, certyn so wrath was she,
That she was out of alle charitee. (449-452)

And I seyde his opinion was good.
What sholde he studie and make hymselfen wood,
Upon a book in cloystre alway to poure,
Or swynken with his handes, and laboure,
As Austyn bit? How shal the worlde be served? (183-187)

He was a gentil harlot and a kynde;
A bettre felawe sholde men noght finde.
He wolde suffre for a quart of wyn
A good felawe to have his concubyn
A twelf month, and excuse him atte ful; (647-651)

There has never been critical doubt as to the irony in these three passages. But it must be noted that Chaucer's description of the gildsman utilizes this same device to the same end.

The gildsmen's array and ambitions are rendered in deft strokes, but the *coup de grace* is provided through Chaucer's description of their cook. The long list of his accomplishments leave no doubt that he is preëminent in his profession. According to Mr. George Unwin, such cooks were prohibitively expensive.⁴ Mr. Carroll Camden thinks it likely that even well-to-do tradesmen would find it too expensive to take such a cook on a pilgrimage. On this clue he builds his hypothesis that this cook actually belongs to the Sergeant of the Lawe and the Frankeleyn, the two wealthiest pilgrims, the latter being also a great gourmand.⁵

In these and other speculations about the cook, one vital fact has been overlooked or insufficiently stressed:

But greet harm was it, as it thoughte me,
That on his shyne a mormal hadde he. (385-386)

Why does Chaucer remark on the "greet harm"? Mr. Walter C. Curry quotes vivid contemporary descriptions of this disease and concludes that it was even "more offensive to the eye" than was the Somonour's "saucefleem" visage.⁶ One mediaeval authority, John of Gaddesden, maintained that a mormal was "oon of the siknes that is contagious."⁷ Summarizing the authorities, a mormal (*malum mortuum*) is caused "by uncleanly personal habits, such as lack of

⁴ *The Guilds and Companies of London* (London, 1925), p. 195.

⁵ "Query on Chaucer's Burgesses," *PQ*, VII (1928), 314-317.

⁶ *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926), pp. 47-49.

⁷ Curry, p. 49.

frequent bathing and the continuous wearing of soiled clothes, by the eating of melancholic foods and the drinking of strong wines, and by disgraceful association with diseased and filthy women."⁸ In the Maunciple's Prologue, the cook is revealed as having just these characteristics. While these traits do not seem to impair the cook's talent, his rioting and "morning-after" condition, as described in the Maunciple's Prologue, certainly impair its exercise.

It seems quite possible, therefore, that this cook is the final satiric touch in the portrait of the gildsmen, who are so eager to put on a good appearance with their new livery, their silver-trimmed knives, their social ambitions, and their High-Class but vitally defective cook.

The satire is made more credible by the fact that the cook has been identified as "Roger de Ware, cook," who appears in one of the *Ward Presentments* of Chaucer's day accused of being a "common nightwalker," to which he pleads guilty.⁹ It does not seem incredible that the combination of his filthy personal habits, his rioting and drunkenness, and his contagious mormal had resulted in his being discharged from some more worthy post than cooking for these tradesmen, who have thus probably been able to engage him at a bargain.

Finally, the fragment of the Cook's Tale makes some points which are descriptive of the cook himself. The apprentice is "of a craft of vitailliers" (4366) and he is a "revelour" who haunts "dys," "riot," and "paramour" to the neglect of his work. This much is certainly true of the cook. Also, he tells us that this apprentice was "sontyme lad with revel to Newgate" (4402), which helps to establish, through this similarity to Roger de Ware, his (the cook's) identity with the apprentice of his tale. Even the hypothesis that the gildsmen's cook had been discharged from a previous employment is made more credible by the fact that this apprentice, who resembles both Chaucer's cook and Roger de Ware, is fired from his job.

"Wel bet is roten appul out of hoord
Than that it rotie al the remenaunt."
So fareth it by a riotous servaunt;
It is ful lasse harm to lete hym pace,
Than he shende alle the servantz in the place.

⁸ Curry, pp. 50-51.

⁹ A. H. Thomas, ed., *Calander of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, 1364-1381* (Cambridge, 1929), p. 156.

And if ther dide, certyn so wrath was she,
That she was out of alle charitee. (449-452)

And I seyde his opinion was good.
What sholde he studie and make hymselfen wood,
Upon a book in cloystre alway to poure,
Or swynken with his handes, and laboure,
As Austyn bit? How shal the worlde be served? (183-187)

He was a gentil harlot and a kynde;
A bettre felawe sholde men noght finde.
He wolde suffre for a quart of wyn
A good felawe to have his concubyn
A twelf month, and excuse him atte ful; (647-651)

There has never been critical doubt as to the irony in these three passages. But it must be noted that Chaucer's description of the gildsmen utilizes this same device to the same end.

The gildsmen's array and ambitions are rendered in deft strokes, but the *coup de grace* is provided through Chaucer's description of their cook. The long list of his accomplishments leave no doubt that he is preëminent in his profession. According to Mr. George Unwin, such cooks were prohibitively expensive.⁴ Mr. Carroll Camden thinks it likely that even well-to-do tradesmen would find it too expensive to take such a cook on a pilgrimage. On this clue he builds his hypothesis that this cook actually belongs to the Sergeant of the Lawe and the Frankeleyn, the two wealthiest pilgrims, the latter being also a great gourmand.⁵

In these and other speculations about the cook, one vital fact has been overlooked or insufficiently stressed:

But greet harm was it, as it thoghte me,
That on his shyne a mormal hadde he. (385-386)

Why does Chaucer remark on the "greet harm"? Mr. Walter C. Curry quotes vivid contemporary descriptions of this disease and concludes that it was even "more offensive to the eye" than was the Somonour's "saucefleem" visage.⁶ One mediaeval authority, John of Gaddesden, maintained that a mormal was "oon of the siknes that is contagious."⁷ Summarizing the authorities, a mormal (*malum mortuum*) is caused "by uncleanly personal habits, such as lack of

⁴ *The Guilds and Companies of London* (London, 1925), p. 195.

⁵ "Query on Chaucer's Burgesses," *PQ*, VII (1928), 314-317.

⁶ *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926), pp. 47-49.

⁷ Curry, p. 49.

frequent bathing and the continuous wearing of soiled clothes, by the eating of melancholic foods and the drinking of strong wines, and by disgraceful association with diseased and filthy women."⁸ In the Maunciple's Prologue, the cook is revealed as having just these characteristics. While these traits do not seem to impair the cook's talent, his rioting and "morning-after" condition, as described in the Maunciple's Prologue, certainly impair its exercise.

It seems quite possible, therefore, that this cook is the final satiric touch in the portrait of the gildsmen, who are so eager to put on a good appearance with their new livery, their silver-trimmed knives, their social ambitions, and their High-Class but vitally defective cook.

The satire is made more credible by the fact that the cook has been identified as "Roger de Ware, cook," who appears in one of the *Ward Presentments* of Chaucer's day accused of being a "common nightwalker," to which he pleads guilty.⁹ It does not seem incredible that the combination of his filthy personal habits, his rioting and drunkenness, and his contagious mormal had resulted in his being discharged from some more worthy post than cooking for these tradesmen, who have thus probably been able to engage him at a bargain.

Finally, the fragment of the Cook's Tale makes some points which are descriptive of the cook himself. The apprentice is "of a craft of vitailliers" (4366) and he is a "revelour" who haunts "dys," "riot," and "paramour" to the neglect of his work. This much is certainly true of the cook. Also, he tells us that this apprentice was "somytyme lad with revel to Newgate" (4402), which helps to establish, through this similarity to Roger de Ware, his (the cook's) identity with the apprentice of his tale. Even the hypothesis that the gildsmen's cook had been discharged from a previous employment is made more credible by the fact that this apprentice, who resembles both Chaucer's cook and Roger de Ware, is fired from his job.

"Wel bet is roten appul out of hoord
Than that it rotie al the remenaunt."
So fareth it by a riotous servaunt;
It is ful lasse harm to lete hym pace,
Than he shende alle the servantz in the place.

⁸ Curry, pp. 50-51.

⁹ A. H. Thomas, ed., *Calander of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, 1364-1381* (Cambridge, 1929), p. 156.

Therefore his maister yaf hym acquitance,
And bad hym go, with sorwe and with meschance! (4406-12)

The cook's presence with the gildsmen, then, may not be an incongruity to be explained away, but a final deft stroke of Chaucer's satiric genius. Although Roger de Ware's reputation was probably known to these gildsmen of London, they did not think it would be known to the wayfaring pilgrims. And they were right, except for Harry Bailly—and Chaucer's audience.

Woman's College,
University of North Carolina

PETER LISCA

Chaucer and the Holy Cross of Bromholm

The curtain speech, the final cry for help uttered by the proud, pert wife of "deynous Symkyn" of Trumpington in the Reeve's Tale, is a masterpiece in miniature. This invocation is completely appropriate to the wife's specific needs of the moment as she recognized them:

"Help! hooly croys of Bromeholm," she seyde,
"In manus tuas! Lord, to thee I calle!
Awak, Symond! the feend is on me falle.
My herte is broken; help! I nam but deed!
Ther lyth oon upon my wombe and on myn heed.
Help, Symkyn, for the false clerkes fighte!"¹

The piece of the true Cross of Bromholm, Roger of Wendover declares, was brought from Constantinople to the Cluniac Priory at Bromholm in 1223, and in the same year miracles began to occur and the life- and health-bringing Cross to be worshipped by people from near and far.

Eodem anno [1223] apud Bromholm increbuerunt divina miracula, ad gloriam et honorem salutiferae crucis, in qua Salvator mundi pati dignatus est pro redemptione generis humani. . . . Hoc denique anno, ut praedictum

¹ See *Canterbury Tales* I (A) 4286-4291 in Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Complete Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 71. Ruth Huff Cline has pointed out that certain saints whom Chaucer's characters swear by, are altogether appropriate; see *MLN*, LX (1945), 480-482; here Professor Cline discusses the aptness of John's swearing by St. Cuthbert in the Reeve's Tale, I (A) 4127.

est, coeperunt divina celebrari miracula, ad laudem et gloriam vivificae crucis, in monasterio praedicto; ubi mortuis vita, caecis visus, claudis gressus restituitur, leprosis caro munda donatur, obsessi a daemonibus liberantur, et quicumque infirmus cum fide ad lignum praedictum accesserit incolumis et sanus recedit. Frequenter autem adoratur et colitur crux praefata, non solum a gente Anglicana, verum etiam ab hominibus de regionibus longe positis, et, qui de illa divina audierunt miracula, devotissime venerantur.²

The precise needs of Symkyn's wife, and the details of the miracles of the Cross of Bromholm as handed down by Roger Wendover, correspond in three particulars:

1. "the feend is on me falle."
obsessi a daemonibus liberantur.
2. "myn herte is broken."
infirmus . . . incolumis et sanus recedit.
3. "I nam but deed!"
mortuis vita . . . restituitur.

Whether Symkyn's wife was able to invoke divine aid with such felicitous accuracy because her father was "the person of the toun," or because of "hir nortelrie that she hadde lerned in the nonnerie," or because the various experiences of the devotees of Bromholm were known at a distance (Trumpington is seventy-five miles from the Priory), is a matter about which we can only speculate. At least we know that she was now free of daemons, and that she soon regained sufficient life and vigor to smite the perilous Symkyn to the floor with the blow of a staff upon his "pyled skull."

University of North Carolina

ROBERT A. PRATT

Some Notes On Vinaver's Malory

Those who read the works of Sir Thomas Malory in Professor Vinaver's edition must be grateful for a text so readable and a commentary so full of interest. Only a revised edition could be better. And indeed the reviews by Mr. C. S. Lewis and Dr. J. A. W.

² See Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. G. Hewlett, Rolls Series, No. 84, II (London, 1887), 274-276. This account was taken over by Matthew Paris; see *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, Rolls Series, No. 57, III (London, 1876), 80-81.

Bennett show that revisions, both great and small, need making. Even a casual reading discovers several points Professor Vinaver might care to reconsider. As, for example, these:

p. 1096, ll. 31-2. *Therefore unto all ladyes I make my mone, yet for my soule ye pray and bury me at the leste*, C (= Caxton), probably emending, has *yet praye for my soule & bery me atte leest*. Vinaver makes no comment, but it seems likely that *yet* was an early corruption of *pat*.

Elsewhere it was the comments that were puzzling. p. 163, ll. 17-18. 'Well,' seyde sir Gawayne, 'I thanke you, for ye have leffte me the yongyst and the fayryste, and hir is me moste levyste.' C has and she is moost leuest to me, but W (= Winchester MS) is good 15th century English: and her that is to me most lief (to modernize a little). But Vinaver, after noting C's variant, comments (p. 1351): "W's reading shows, however, that *levyste* should be taken here as an adverb ('gladly,' 'willingly') with the verb 'to have' understood: 'for it is her I should have most willingly'." I find this far from clear.

In his commentary upon the tale of Sir Gareth, Professor Vinaver attempts to strengthen his case for equating Gareth and Gaheret by pointing out (pp. 1420-1) a 'striking point of resemblance.' Gareth has *fayre handys* (he was large and longe and brode in the shuldyrs, well-rysaged, and the largyst and the fayreste-handid¹ that ever man sye.) Gaharet, equally handsome and modest, has *le brach destre plus long que lautre*, which Vinaver supposes a defect. Now it had puzzled Professor Vinaver to know why on earth Sir Kay, who thought he saw before him a young man, handsome in appearance but in no way drawing him to *jantyll tacchis*, should mock the young man by naming him Beaumains. But happily he found a solution: Sir Kay 'thought he would hurt the young knight by reminding him that he had one arm longer than the other.' But there is no reason to suppose that a long arm is two fair hands.

Professor Vinaver has a note on the anonymous damsel that Malory, 'to simplify the *personnel*,' has identified with Brangwayne (see p. 538 and pp. 615-6 and the note on p. 1482). In Malory's source, the damsel sent to Tristram and the damsel that bears the letters are one and the same. But in Malory, only the former is

¹ There seems to be a misprint in Vinaver's text. P. 293, l. 30, has *fayrest handis*. Caxton has *the fayrest and the largest handed*.

identified with Brangwayne. And therefore Vinaver's complaint, that what the latter damsel says is 'ill-suited to Brangwayne,' is groundless.

Pp. 628, l. 28-683, l. 4. For, as bookis reporte, of sir Trystram cam all the good termys of ventry and of huntynge . . . ; and many other blastis and termys, that all maner jantylmen hath cause to the worldes ende to prayse sir Trystram and to pray for his soule. AMEN, SAYDE SIR THOMAS MALLEORRÉ. Vinaver's opinion (p. 1498) that the last sentence is 'probably a scribal addition' disclaiming personal responsibility for what immediately precedes it, could have been made credible if it had been supported by other instances of a scribal interpolation of this sort. As it stands, the amen seems exactly what one would expect from Malory himself.

P. 1257, ll. 25-32. Sir Lancelot prayed the Bysshop that his felowes myght bere his body to Joyous Garde. . . . 'Howbeit,' sayde syr Launcelot, 'me repenteth sore, but I made myn avowe somtyme that in Joyous Garde I wold be buryed. And bycause of brekyng of myn avowe, I praye you al, lede me thyder.' The OED cites *By cause of brekyng of myn avowe* giving to *because* (A2C) the meaning of *for the sake of not, for fear of*. Professor Vinaver, in his note on p. 1644, takes the phrase to mean *because I broke my vows*. (Vows to Guinevere presumably, but he is not specific.) Under this interpretation, what Lancelot says seems indeed 'a series of incongruous remarks.' Wondering why, and preferring to look for the reason in his texts, Vinaver goes to the corresponding lines of *Le Morte Arthur*.

And to Ioyes garde then me lede.

Sometyme my trowthe ther-to I plyght,

Allas, me for-thynketh that I so dyd.

(ll. 3845-9)

These he interprets as meaning that Lancelot regrets 'having pledged his faith to Guinevere.' But this 'must have seemed to M a perversion of the true meaning of the story.' And we are to suppose that in the struggle to save Lancelot as a true lover Malory became unable to compose coherent speech for him.

I was not concerned to examine the vocabulary prepared by Professor G. L. Brook, but here are two points:

p. 441, l. 25. *for I was never ferde to renayne my lorde*. Caxton has *to reneye*. The meaning of *renayne* is clearly *deny* or *disown*. But why should Sir Lamorak have been never afraid to deny his lord? The word *to* has here the meaning of *so as to*. The nearest OED citation I can find is this: *Ne be nat proude . . . Yn pyn herte to make a rous*. (TO.B17). The more common phrase *afraid to* has obscured the meaning, and Brook, guessing from the context, gives name for *renayne*.

p. 473, ll. 20-2. *sir La Cote Male Tayle sanke ryght downe uppon the erthe, what forwounded and forbled he myght nat stonde*. Caxton has *what forbled*. The glossary, again guessing from the context, gives *so* for *what*. But I prefer to see here a fusion of two idioms: *what for* in the sense of *because of*, *in view of*, (OED: WHAT. DII 2b) as in the mid-15th century citation *what for hungry, what for thriste*, and *for-* meaning *greatly*.

Newcastle University College,
New South Wales

D. C. MUECKE

Grimald's *Christus Redivivus* and the Digby Resurrection Play

Another of Grimald's sources for the *Christus Redivivus* which has so far not been considered¹ is *Christ's Burial and Resurrection* from Bodleian MS. e Museo 160.² All of the scenes in this play in which the three Marys appear show remarkable resemblances to the corresponding scenes in Grimald's play. Both plays begin with a lament by Mary Magdalen as she awaits the arrival of the other two Marys. The name of the third Mary in itself is an indication of resemblance, since in Grimald's play and the Digby play alone does she appear as Mary Cleophis rather than Mary Jacobi according to the usual tradition.

¹ See *Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, ed. Le Roy Merrill (New Haven, 1925), p. 59 ff; G. C. Taylor, "The *Christus Redivivus* of Nicholas Grimald and the Hegge Resurrection Plays," *PMLA*, xli (1925), 840-59; C. H. Herford, *The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1886), p. 116; H. H. Hudson, "Grimald's Translations from Beza," *MLN*, xxxix (1924), 388-94; F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford, 1914), p. 26.

² *The Digby Plays*, Ed. F. J. Furnival (London, 1896), pp. 169-226.

Close resemblances in language appear in Mary Magdalen's monologue:³

DIGBY

Yet was he Cain not so malicious
Ose the cruel Jewes most outragiose
...
When so grete rigore & tyrannye
Was in there harts, to garre hym dye
Which was so gracious aye.

GRIMALD

O vos iniqui Iudaci, o scelere inflamati
acerrimo,
O uos feri, o uiolenti, o & multo crudelissimi ...
Quid est quod tantopere bilem concitauerat tuam?
In hunc spectatum hominum.

The second scene shows the comforting of Mary Magdalen, and here again the parallels are strikingly close:⁴

Ales when I remember his woe,
Scantly may I speke or goo,
In harte I have such payn.

Verum ista dolorum auget commemoratio.

What woman is this that lyes here?
It is mawdlyen, alese!

Sedet Magdalis in medio posita Mar-
more ...
Nec iam uocem ullam ualet amplius
emittere ...
... non secus ac esset mortus.

... to remember the fell torment
And cruell pain of this Innocent.

Sic caesum insotem, saltem, lamentarier.

The next scene in which the Marys appear is the visit to the tomb. In both plays this scene is taken up largely by a recounting of some details of Christ's ministry, and the scenes both possess the interesting detail:⁵

Sister, I perceyve the place is her-
bye ...
Let us ordeyn our oyntmentes accord-
inglye.

Sed enim nunc tandem ad tumultum
uenimus ...
Vos cecitote, e gremijs ne quid odor-
um excidet.

The Marys appear next in the *Hortulanus*, the appearance to Mary Magdalen in the garden, and again Grimald follows the Digby play in action and emphasis, as he does in the next scene, the appear-

³ *Digby Plays*, p. 201. Merrill, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁴ *Digby Plays*, p. 202. Merrill, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁵ *Digby Plays*, p. 205. Merrill, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

ance in the garden to the other two Marys, a scene unique in these two plays, and unbiblical. In this scene is also a common emphasis upon the special sorrow felt by Peter because of his betrayal.

The final appearance of the Marys occurs in the scene where Mary Magdalen announces the resurrection to Peter and John. Again the resemblances are close, for example:⁶

God graunte youre wordes been not	... certe me praedicas? (Peter)
in vain. (Peter)	Certissima. Mary)
That I say is true and certayn	
And therefore doubt no more. (Mary)	

In both plays Peter remains incredulous until convinced by the testimony of the other two Marys, again a detail not found in any other treatment.

Although Taylor has established the possibility that Grimald has access to the Hegge plays, the mystery which surrounds the early history of the Digby Resurrection play prevents speculation as to what, if any, connection between the two manuscripts existed at the time of Grimald's writing. He may have had access to MS. e Museo 160 while he was resident in Oxford after 1540. It appears from the fact that, since none of the material derived from the Hegge play occurs in the Digby play, the Digby play may have been Grimald's original source, and the Hegge play used to fill in gaps in the biblical story.

The Setting of the Watch, and its attendant detail, the Harrowing of Hell, the Journey to Emmaus, and the Incredulity of Thomas, are all taken from the Hegge play, and completely missing from the Digby manuscript. On the other hand, the Hegge play contains all of the Mary material, but in a form which bears no resemblance to Grimald's treatment. This would make it appear that the Digby play was Grimald's primary source.

University of Missouri

PATRICIA ABEL

⁶ *Digby Plays*, p. 224. Merrill, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

The *Eikon Basilike*: An Unreported Item in the Contemporary Authorship Controversy

In his admirable *A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike*¹ F. F. Madan supplies a bibliography of the controversy on the authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*. It contains six items earlier than the Anglesey Memorandum of 1690, of which Milton's *Eikonoklastes* is the fourth. To these a seventh item may be added, which would be number six in the chronological sequence:

The None-Such Charles His Character: Extracted, Out of divers Originall Transactions, Dispatches and the Notes of severall Publick Ministers, and Councillors of State as wel at home as abroad. Published by Authority. London, Printed by R. I. and are to be sold by John Collins in Little Brittain, MDCLI. British Museum pressmark: E.1345.(2). Collation: 8°, A*B-O*P⁴. Contents: A1 blank; A2^r title; A3^r-A4^r "To the Reader." B1^r: text begins; ends O2^r. O3^r-P3^r, "The Contents of this Booke." Pagination: B1^r is page 1; continuous to p. 195 (O2^r).

Thomason dated his copy January 6, 1651.

The authorship of *The None-Such Charles* is uncertain. Without committing its support, *DNB* reports that the book has been attributed to Sir Balthazar Gerbier, and this attribution is tentatively adopted by Halkett and Laing. There may seem to be some support for this view in the manner in which Gerbier's experiences as Buckingham's envoy are reported (pp. 110-114). On the other hand, the author's relentless malice, not only towards Charles but towards James as well, and his unqualified support of the Commonwealth government, are hard to reconcile with Gerbier's career, and it seems safer not to accept the attribution.

The None-Such Charles treats the *Eikon Basilike* very gingerly. The book's strategy is to return public attention, which had been increasingly fastened upon the idealizing "King's Image," to those aspects of Charles's life and conduct which had made him widely unpopular before the reaction touched off by his execution. Accordingly, instead of directly attacking the *Eikon Basilike*, as Milton and his predecessor, the author of the *Eikon Alethine* (1649), had done, *The None-Such Charles* avoids, so far as possible, mentioning it at all. Indeed, it never actually names the *Eikon Basilike*, and the single unmistakable reference to it grows out of one of the endless attacks

¹ Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, New Series, Vol. III, 1950.

on Charles's character: despite his personal obligations to Ben Jonson, and his ridiculous dotage on that poet's work, Charles was so ungrateful and miserly to him as to shame the English crown; and here the story is told of Charles's proffered gift, so little and so late, to the dying, poverty-stricken Ben, and the latter's scornful rejection of it.² There follows a passage which denies Charles's authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*:

And this said mans soule, was more fixt on *Bens* verses, and other Romances, during the time of his imprisonment, then on those holy Writs, wherein salvation is to be sought for the soul, as well as for the body. Yet some men of these times, will be gulled, and made beleieve that he who could never speak nor write but like a Tyrant, could at last write like a Divine [pp. 170-171].

It may be observed that this represents a reversal of the government line, as taken by Milton, on the authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*, and a return to something more like the position of the *Eikon Alethine*.³

University of Chicago

ERNEST SIRLUCK

Pope and Cibber's *The Non-Juror*

The quarrel between Pope and Cibber is generally thought to have originated in the controversy over *Three Hours after Marriage* by Gay, Pope and Arbuthnot. In this play, produced at Drury Lane on January 16, 1717, Pope probably wrote the lines for Cibber, as Plotwell, which made him satirize himself. Cibber retaliated by inserting a gibe at the play in his performance as Bayes, and a backstage altercation followed. On December 6 of the same year Cibber's *The Non-Juror* was acted with unparalleled success, provoking a number of abusive pamphlets, one of which, *A Clue To the Comedy of the Non-Juror*, is attributed to Pope. Another item should be added to this series, for *The Non-Juror* contains three references to Pope's works which are ironic in the inapposite atmosphere of the play.

² See J. F. Bradley and J. Q. Adams, *The Jonson Allusion Book* (Yale Univ. Press, 1922), p. 295.

³ See Ernest Sirluck, "Eikon Basilike, Eikon Alethine, and Eikonoklastes," *MLN*, LXIX (1954), pp. 497-502.

Before presenting Cibber's comments, it is important to emphasize the device Pope employed to ridicule him in *Three Hours after Marriage*. The character of Clinket has always been ascribed to Pope, who very likely wrote the whole of the scene with the players in Act 1. Plotwell, acted by Cibber, pretends that he wrote Clinket's play, which is given a brief rehearsal and then presented to a leading critic and two players for their consideration. The satire on Cibber was explained in a pamphlet by "E. Parker, *Philomath*":

*Plotwell's fathering Clinket's Play, is levell'd at Cibber, and the Satire bites, when he is told, That a Parrot and a Player can utter human Sounds, but neither of them are allow'd to be Judges of Wit. This is hard upon poor Colley, who has oblig'd the Public with, The Bulls and the Bears a Farce. Perolla and Izadora, An original Tragedy of his own Composing; he has also Naturaliz'd the Cid of Corneille into an English Heroick Daughter. Which will see the Light, as soon as Mr. Pope has touch'd it up, who has it now for that Purpose, the Diction being somewhat obnubilated.*¹

Sir Tremendous to Clinket. *Between you and I Madam, this Gentleman (Plotwell alias Cibber) knows nothing of Poetry, but is a damn'd Writer. Probatum est.*²

Joseph Gay (John Durant Breval) in *The Confederates*, a farce directed against the triumvirate of authors, makes Cibber acknowledge the joke:

C. Those Freedoms I'd forgive, if mixt with Sense,
And pass a Jest, tho' at my own Expence;³

Cibber must have known that he had ingeniously been made to speak against himself, and it is not surprising that he utilized the same device to satirize Pope in *The Non-Juror*.

The first reference to Pope is in Act 1: Maria, a coquette played by Mrs. Oldfield, "takes a Book from the Table, and reads" when her solemn lover, Heartly, enters. He speaks to her, and we discover that she is reading *The Rape of the Lock*:

Heart. . . . Madam— your most obedient— What have you got there pray?

Mar. [*Repeating.*]

"Her lively Looks a sprightly Mind disclose,

¹ E. Parker, *A Complete KEY To the New Farce, call'd Three Hours after Marriage* (London: E. Berrington, 1717), p. 8.

² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³ (London: R. Burleigh, 1717), p. 25. Breval, like "E. Parker," refers to Cibber's *Bulls and Bears* and also has Pope offer to correct *Ximena: or, The Heroick Daughter*:

"I'll to Perfection bring the mighty Cid." *Ximena* had been acted in 1712, and was revived in 1718. Cibber accepts the offer and agrees to continue *Three Hours* to the third night; it actually ran for seven.

"Quick, as her Eyes, and as unfix'd as those—

Hear. Pray, Madam, What is it?

Mar. "Favours to none, to all she Smiles extends—

Hear. Nay, I will see—

[Struggling.]

Mar. [Putting him by.]

"Oft she rejects— but never once offends.

Col. Have a Care, she has dipt into her own Character, and she'll never forgive you, if you don't let her through with it.

Hear. I beg your Pardon, Madam.

Gravely

Mar. "Bright as the Sun, her Eyes the Gazers strike,

"And like the Sun, they shine on all alike— um— um.

Hear. That is something like indeed.

Col. You would say so, if you knew all.

Hear. All what? Pray what do you mean?

Col. Have a little Patience, I'll tell you immediately.

Hear. [Aside.] Confusion! some Coxcomb now has been flattering her, I'll be curst else, she's so full of her dear self upon't.

Mar. [Turning to Heartly.]

"If to her Share some Female Errors fall,

"Look on her Face— and you'll forget them all.

Is not that natural, Mr. Heartly?

Hear. For a Woman to expect it is indeed.⁴

This quotation from Canto II implies no criticism of *The Rape of the Lock*, except as it is cleverly applied to the character of a giddy, vain girl, acted by Mrs. Oldfield. Pope's well-known comment upon her burial suggests, however, that their relations had not been cordial:

"Odious! in woollen! 'twould a Saint provoke,
(Were the last words that poor Narcissa spoke) ⁵

The irony consists, of course, in quoting Pope, who had been often attacked for his Catholicism and placed "among the Jacobites,"⁶ in a play which violently inveighs against both.

The second allusion to Pope's works is more casual; it refers to his translation of the *Iliad*, the third volume of which had been published in June. Maria's entrance "with a Book" doubtless indicated the stratagem to the audience:

Mar. O! Your Servant Mr. Charles— Here take this odious Homer, and lay him up again, he tires me.

[Exit Betty with the Book.

How could the blind Wretch make such a horried fuss about a fine Woman.

⁴ Colley Cibber, *The Non-Juror* (London: B. Lintot, 1718), pp. 7-8.

⁵ F. W. Bateson, ed., "Epistle to Cobham," *Epistles to Several Persons* (London: Methuen, 1951), pp. 34-35. See the notes on these pages for an identification of the lines with Mrs. Oldfield.

⁶ George Sherburn, *The Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), pp. 159-161.

for so many Volumes together, and give us no Account of her Amours? You have read him I suppose in the *Greek*, Mr. Charles.

Charles. Not lately, Madam.

Mar. But do you so violently admire him now?

Charles. The Criticks say he has his Beauties, Madam. But *Ovid* has been always my Favorite.⁷

Maria admits that she is reading Homer in English, probably in Pope's translation, and her comment upon the subject matter is characteristic and amusing.

The third allusion is a clever and biting satiric thrust; the previous references make it clear that Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard* has evoked Doctor Wolf's reflections in the second seduction scene with Lady Woodvil:

Doct. . . . You, Madam, were the subject of my solitary Thoughts, I take in all the little aids I can to Guard my Frailty, and truly I have receiv'd great Consolation from an Unfortunate Example here before me.

Lady W. Pray of what kind Sir?

Doct. I had just dipt into poor *Eloisas* Passion for *Abelard*; It is indeed a piteous Conflict! How Terrible! How Penitent a Sense she shews of Guilty Pleasures past, and fruitless Pains to shut them from her Memory.

Lady W. I have read her Story Sir.

Doct. Is it not Pitiful?

Lady W. A Heart of Stone might feel for her.

Doct. O! think then, what I endure for you, such are my Pains.⁸

This attempt to justify illicit love by a depraved and traitorous non-juror is adroit irony, particularly felicitous as a return thrust to the satire of Cibber in *Three Hours after Marriage*.

Pope apparently, however, had the last word in *A Clue To the Comedy of the Non-Juror*, which wittily demonstrates that the play is really a satire on the Whigs. If, as Sherburn believes,⁹ "private considerations" did not enter the Cibber-Pope controversy before 1742, it was because Pope was forced to be cautious in a controversy which could only have seriously damaged his reputation in the political atmosphere of 1718.

Oxford University

WILLIAM M. PETERSON

⁷ Cibber, *The Non-Juror*, p. 29.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

⁹ George Sherburn, "The Fortunes and Misfortunes of *Three Hours after Marriage*," *MP*, XXIV (1926), 109.

Smollett's Satire on the Hutchinsonians

One of the originals Smollett introduced in the prison scene in *The Adventures of Ferdinand Count Fathom* (chapters 39-41) is the mad and impoverished pedant Sir Mungo Barebones. Sir Mungo is a Hebrew scholar whose hobby-horse is the theory that all truth is divulged in the Pentateuch ("he affirmed that the perfection of all arts and sciences might be attained by studying these secret memoirs"), and therefore that the science taught by Newton is false. He was always "wrapt in visionary conferences with Moses on the Mount." Sir Mungo's chief project, however, is to determine the exact meaning of the Hebrew word *Elohim* by an "anagrammatical analysis" and thereby to convert the Jews and Gentiles to Protestantism.

The parallels between Sir Mungo and the theologian John Hutchinson (1674-1737) are so close and numerous that there can be little doubt Smollett intended in Sir Mungo a satire on the entire Hutchinsonian school. Like Sir Mungo, who sought to "restore the writings of Moses to that pre-eminence and veneration which is due to an inspired author" and who "spoke of the immortal Newton with infinite contempt," Hutchinson was notorious for insisting that the Pentateuch contains all truth, divine and earthly, for playing fast and loose with Hebrew pointing and etymology in order to make the Pentateuch conform to this thesis, and for claiming that since the writings of Moses teach a physics different from Newton's, Newton must be wrong (his major work is entitled *Moses's Principia*).

In choosing to have Sir Mungo "exert his endeavours in settling the precise meaning of the word *Elohim*," Smollett was alluding to one of the best known consequences of Hutchinson's voluminous writings. On the basis of a philological argument Hutchinson had claimed that the word proves the unity of the Trinity and alludes to a covenant whereby the *Elohim* pledged themselves to redeem man. Consequently he insisted that the proper understanding of the word is essential to a right understanding of the chief doctrines of religion. In 1735 Alexander S. Catcott delivered a sermon in defense of Hutchinson's interpretation of the word,¹ and immediately a battle of pamphlets broke out, reaching a climax in 1751,² two years before

¹ *The Supreme and Inferiour Elahim* (London, 1742; second ed.).

² An advertisement appended to Catcott's work lists nine other pamphlets on the subject between 1736 and 1741. In 1751 Thompas Sharp, archdeacon

the publication of *Count Fathom*. Since even the periodicals carried on the dispute,³ the subject was obviously sufficiently in the public attention to lend itself to satiric treatment.

That Smollett felt strongly about the Hutchinsonians is clear from a passage in his *History of England*. Commenting on the state of religion and philosophy in the reign of George II, he wrote:

Fanaticism also formed a league with false philosophy. One Hutchinson, a visionary, intoxicated with the fumes of rabbinical learning, pretended to deduce all demonstration from Hebrew roots, and to confine all human knowledge to the five books of Moses. His disciples became numerous after his death . . . they . . . bitterly inveighed against Newton as an ignorant pretender, who had presumed to set up his own ridiculous chimeras in opposition to the sacred philosophy of the Pentateuch.⁴

The Johns Hopkins University

EARL R. WASSERMAN

Shaftesbury in Joseph Warton's *Enthusiast*

It is clear that the first of the following passages is the direct source of the second:

Imagine then, good PHILOCLEES, if being taken with the Beauty of the Ocean which you see yonder at a distance, it shou'd come into your head, to seek how to command it; and like some mighty Admiral, ride Master of the Sea: wou'd not the Fancy be a little absurd?

Absurd enough, in Conscience. The next thing I shou'd do, 'tis likely, upon this Frenzy, wou'd be to hire some Bark, and go in Nuptial Ceremony, VENETIAN-like, to wed the *Gulf*, which I might call perhaps as properly *my own*.

Let who will call it theirs, reply'd THEOCLES, you will own *the Enjoyment* of this kind to be very different from that which shou'd naturally follow from the Contemplation of the Ocean's *Beauty*. The Bridegroom-Doge, who in his stately *Bucentaur* floats on the Bosom of his THETIS, has less *Possession* than the poor *Shepherd*, who from a hanging Rock, or Point of some high Promon-

of Northumberland, attacked Catcott in *Two Dissertations concerning the Etymology and Scripture-Meaning of the Hebrew Words Elohim and Berith, Occasioned by some Notions lately advanced in relation to them*. This work was immediately answered in tracts by James Moody, Julius Bate, Benjamin Holloway, and other followers of Hutchinson.

³ E. g., *Gentleman's Magazine*, XX (1750), 492, 548, 549; XXI (1751), 11, 62, 126, 157, 205, 273, 311, 370; XXII (1752), 205.

⁴ (London, 1841), IV, 459.

tory, stretch'd at his ease, forgets his feeding Flocks, while he admires her Beauty.¹

Yon' Shepherd idly stretcht on the rude Rock,
Listening to dashing Waves, and Sea-Mews Clang
High-hovering o'er his Head, who views beneath
The Dolphin dancing o'er the level Brine,
Feels more true Bliss than the proud Ammiral,
Amid his Vessels bright with burnish'd Gold
And silken Streamers, tho' his lordly Nod
Ten thousand War-worn Mariners revere.²

Shaftesbury makes a distinction between material possession and the aesthetic experience, which he interprets as a movement toward higher forms of the *pulchrum* and *honestum* and ultimately as an act of identification with divinity. For this complex doctrine Warton substitutes a facile contrast between nature and art—a contrast, to be sure, which is encouraged by Shaftesbury. The following sentence, not far away from the passage on the admiral and the shepherd, is almost too familiar for quotation:

Even the rude *Rocks*, the mossy *Caverns*, the irregular unwrought *Grotto's*, and broken *Falls* of Waters, with all the horrid Graces of the *Wilderness* itself, as representing NATURE more, will be the more engaging, and appear with a Magnificence beyond the formal Mockery of Princely Gardens.³

Cross-references in the *Characteristicks* could easily lead a reader to associate the section just quoted with the following, which is only part of a long and important footnote:

How fares it with our *Princely Genius*, our *Grandee* who assembles all these *Beautys*, and within the Bounds of his sumptuous Palace incloses all these Graces of a thousand kinds?—What Pains! Study! Science!—Behold the Disposition and Order of these finer Sorts of Apartments, Gardens, *Villa's*!—The kind of Harmony to the Eye, from the various Shapes and Colours agreeably mixt, and rang'd in Lines, intercrossing without confusion, and fortunately co-incident.—A *Parterre*, Cypress's, Groves, Wildernesses.—Statues, here and there, of *Virtue*, *Fortitude*, *Temperance*.—*Hero's*-Busts, *Philosophers*-Heads; with suitable Motto's and Inscriptions.—Solemn Representations of things deeply natural.—*Caves*, *Grotto's*, *Rocks*.—*Urns* and *Obelisks* in retir'd places, and dispos'd at proper distances and points of Sight: with all those Symmetrys which silently express a reigning *Order*, *Peace*, *Harmony*, and

¹ Shaftesbury, *Characteristicks* (1737-38), II, 396. "The Moralists, A Rhapsody," Part 3, Sect. 2. References below are to this edition.

² Joseph Warton, *The Enthusiast: or, The Lover of Nature* (London, 1744), p. 8 [11.57-64]. References below are to this edition, with line numbers supplied.

³ *Characteristicks*, II, 393-94.

Beauty!—But what is there answerable to this, in the MINDS of the Possessors?—What Possession or Propriety is theirs? What Constancy or Security of Enjoyment? What Peace, what Harmony WITHIN?"⁴

Material beauties, whether natural or artificial, are subordinated by Shaftesbury to "that happier and higher Symmetry and Order of a Mind."⁵ But Warton seizes on the passages in Shaftesbury, such as those quoted, which belittle artificial splendor, and echoes them in the opening lines of *The Enthusiast*:

Lead me from Gardens deckt with Art's vain Poms.
Can gilt Alcoves, can Marble-mimic Gods,
Parterres embroider'd, Obelisks, and Urns
Of high Relief; can the long, spreading Lake,
Or Vista lessening to the Sight; can *Stow*
With all her Attic Fanes, such Raptures raise,
As the Thrush-haunted Copse, etc.⁶

To state the situation broadly, Warton adapts in the service of "Nature" against "Art" various kinds of imagery and even various ideas of cultural and spiritual progress which could be twisted in the direction of primitivism. The footnotes in the first edition of *The Enthusiast*, not all preserved in later editions, acknowledge suggestions of this kind from the Roman poets.⁷ The primitivistic slant which he gives to Lucretius has been well described by Audley L. Smith, though without reference to Warton's early notes.⁸ Thomson's *Seasons*, it could be shown, is put under contribution in much the same way. Except for the group of adaptations from the Roman poets Warton's borrowings in *The Enthusiast* are unacknowledged, and no doubt some are not yet identified.

The Rice Institute

ALAN D. McKILLOP

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 184-85. "Miscellaneous Reflections," Misc. 3, Chap. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 139. "An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour," Part 4, Sect. 2.

⁶ Ll. 4-10.

⁷ The references are: l. 65—*Aeneid*, VIII (Warton follows VIII, 190 ff., 347-68. Cf. his comments in his edition of Virgil [London, 1753], III, 410-11); ll. 78, 119—Lucretius, V, 940, &c., 997 (i.e., V, 937-39, 955-57, 999-1001, 1004-10), quoted with comment; l. 88—Tibullus (II, iii, 71-74), quoted; l. 105—Horace, *Odes*, III, xxiv (9-13), quoted. This list does not include a few other references added in later editions.

⁸ "The Primitivism of Joseph Warton," *MLN*, XLII (1927), 501-04.

Cowper's *Connoisseur* Essays

So much has been written about Cowper's insanity and his melancholy that one easily forgets that as a young man he was a member of a Nonsense Club, associating with such gay young fellows as Bonnell Thornton, George Colman, and Robert Lloyd. As a result of this association Cowper contributed a few essays to the *Connoisseur*, a periodical conducted by Thornton and Colman. He is usually credited with three *Connoisseur* essays (Nos. 119, 134, and 138) by his biographers and editors; Alexander Chalmers long ago also ascribed Nos. 111 and 115 to him.¹ The poet himself is the authority for Nos. 119, 134, and 138 being his,² and *Connoisseur* No. 140, by Thornton and Colman, is the authority for this authorship of the earlier two. There, in No. 140, "a friend, a gentleman of the Temple," is declared the author of Nos. 111, 115, and 119. Cowper was, of course, "a friend" of the editors, and "a gentleman of the Temple" in 1756, the year of these essays. Since No. 111 is signed "W. C.," and since Cowper includes No. 119 in his list of his essays, there should be little hesitation today to accept all five as Cowper's. The essays do not add to Cowper's stature as a writer; they are not particularly distinguished. Hundreds of essays similar to these had already been tossed off by periodical writers, and hundreds more were to appear. Their tone is one of good-natured satire; the author is working at being a "wit." But the essays are of some interest other than intrinsic, for Cowper was to recall them in later years, incorporating some of the ideas into his poetry. Nowhere is this more notable than in *Conversation*, a poem whose subject is identical with that of *Connoisseur* No. 138. It will be recalled that *Conversation*, following the almost unrelieved monotony and moralizing of *Table Talk*, *The Progress of Error*, *Truth*, *Expostulation*, *Hope*, and *Charity* in the 1782 *Poems*, affords the reader a new and pleasing note, one that was to be reinforced by *Retirement*, which follows it. The comparative lightness of *Conversation*, whatever the mood of the moment that prompted it, is reminiscent of the essays written by a young man with few cares in the world.

Connoisseur No. 138 (Sept. 16, 1756) distinguishes, in its opening

¹ *British Essayists* (London, 1823), xxv, xxxvii. H. S. Milford, ed. Cowper's *Poems* (Oxford, 1926), p. xxv, accepts the five.

² William Hayley, *Life and Letters of William Cowper* (London, 1812), iv, 383.

paragraph, between the English nation which has been "generally supposed to be of a sullen and uncommunicative disposition" and the "loquacious French [who] have been allowed to possess the art of conversing beyond all other people." In *Conversation*, after Cowper admits of the English that "The Fear of being silent makes us mute" (l. 352), he goes on to add that "Few Frenchmen of this evil have complained" (l. 359). And he reverts to this difference between the English and French again in *The Task* (V, 467-472). One of the butts of Cowper's gentle satire in the same essay is the "emphatical" speaker; another, appearing in the same paragraph, is the whisperer who "may be said to measure noses with you." The two are combined in *Conversation*:

Th' emphatic speaker dearly loves t'oppose
In contact inconvenient, nose to nose,
As if the gnomon on his neighbor's phiz,
Touch'd with a magnet, had attracted his.
His whisper'd theme, dilated and at large,
Prove's after all a wind-gun's airy charge.
(ll. 269-274)

The "Silent Men" of the essay, "afraid of opening their mouths, lest they should catch cold," who "literally observe the precept of the Gospel, by letting their conversation be only yea yea, and nay nay" are brilliantly portrayed in one of the more memorable passages in the poem (ll. 379-404).³ One sentence in the essay, "The rational intercourse kept up by conversation, is one of our principal distinctions from brutes," is expressed again in six lines of the poem (ll. 427-432). Finally, and far less striking as a resemblance, the essay glances at "Half-swearers" while the poem deplores the frequency with which men have recourse to oaths (ll. 55-74).

Although the other essays by Cowper do not anticipate so markedly the material of a subsequent poem there are a few similarities that may be mentioned. *Connoisseur* No. 111, on an effeminate young man, condemns Billy Suckling for making his health the chief theme of his conversation. The fault is satirized in *Conversation* (ll. 311-324), and there is one faint verbal echo. And Cowper flashes out at effeminate young men, "as smooth/ And tender as a girl" in *The Task* (ll. 226-227). No. 134, on malpractices of the country clergy, briefly satirizes the priest who hunts with the squire, a fault Cowper

³ Note lines 381-382: "Yes ma'am, and no ma'am, utter'd softly, show/ Ev'ry five minutes how the minutes go."

was to mention in some lines of *The Progress of Error* (111-115), beginning "A cassock'd huntsman and a fiddling priest." There is the possibility that the poet wrote other essays in the periodical, for many of them are still seeking an author, but in the absence of external evidence it seems wisest to forego conjecture based solely on internal evidence.

University of Illinois

ARTHUR SHERBO

Keats' Well Examined Urn

In Keats' "Ode on a Grecian Urn," the generalization "Beauty is truth, truth beauty" is usually considered to be best understood when taken in context and applied to art as represented especially by the urn and by the poem about it. Out of context, the line evokes the kind of vague metaphysics that has led Eliot to condemn it as a serious blemish, either incomprehensible or untrue.¹ Keats himself, interestingly enough, seemed just as acutely aware of the same problem, especially in those moments in which he described himself as being cheated away from reality or teased out of thought. Clearly he did not fail to remind us on which side of nightingale or urn human beings must live. If for a moment the silent form of the urn "dost tease us out of thought/ As doth eternity," we are carefully put back into thought with the words "Cold Pastoral," addressed to the urn as a lifeless object. Similarly, if the urn remains through time as a "friend to man" to whom it utters the sweeping generalization "Beauty is truth, truth beauty," Keats is also careful to add in words addressed and applied directly to the urn and to no one else—and this is the reading that interests me—"that is all ye [i. e., the urn] know on earth, and all ye need to know [as an urn]." In this reading, mankind is not being told for all time what he knows or needs to know. Instead, Keats is merely telling the urn that by virtue of its nature as a thing of beauty it cannot but convey its truth solely in terms of its beauty. Its truth and its beauty are one and the same; otherwise, it would not be of aesthetic

¹ Many other critics, of course, have taken this position, including Middleton Murray and H. W. Garrod.

interest, it would not have anything beautiful to say, and it would not be a friend of man. By way of analogy, we might just as well say that like an urn, a fine clock on the wall is a friend to man, to whom it says, "truth is time, time truth." And it would be quite as legitimate in addressing the clock to say, "This is all ye know on earth, and all ye need to know." It would be meaningless to apply the aphorisms to the mind of man; for like minds bound by Kant's "categories of the understanding," an accurate clock and a beautiful urn are so constituted that the only kinds of truth capable of radiating out of them are truths about time or beauty, respectively. Because Keats understood the nature of a beautiful urn, he was able to make an *a priori* judgment about all art. Surely he realized man needs to know much more than this.

In all fairness it should be observed that the closing words of the poem may be taken ambiguously. Read as an address to humanity, man is being given an aesthetic truism as the summary of all earthly knowledge and told that this is all the information he needs. Taken as an address to the urn, we are being told nothing more difficult than those things that only art is capable of telling us, and this is all art need tell us—a far more acceptable idea, philosophically speaking. Art is thus, as in "Sleep and Poetry," a "friend/ To sooth the cares, and lift the thoughts of man." Fundamentally, the justification of either interpretation is as much a problem of syntax as it is one of philosophy. It is true the pronoun "ye" may be taken as a nominative singular or plural (addressed to the singular urn or the plural mankind), though even as a singular, "ye" could possibly refer back to "man" as its antecedent, except that the subject of the whole final sentence of the poem is clearly "thou," the urn. The strongest grammatical argument favoring the urn as an object of address is that throughout the poem Keats is addressing himself directly to the urn or the figures upon it: "Thou still unravished bride," "Bold Lover, never, never canst thou kiss," "happy boughs! that cannot shed/ Your leaves," "To what green altar, O mysterious priest," and in the important last verse, "*Thou*, silent form," "*Thou* shalt remain . . . a friend to man . . . to whom *thou* say'st." So why not "this is all *ye* know"?

Mr. Earl R. Wasserman in his penetrating study of the poem assumes that the words "that is all/ Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know" are addressed directly to man, the reader. But he makes a good case for controlling the applicability of the truth-

beauty aphorism by claiming that the pronoun "that" has as its antecedent not the aphorism immediately preceding, but the entire preceding sentence. Because "the antecedent of 'that' cannot reasonably be the aphorism—since neither urn nor poet can be saying that all man knows and needs to know on earth is that beauty is truth—its antecedent must be the entire preceding sentence. All that man knows on earth, and all he needs to know is that

When old age shall this generation waste,
Thou [the urn] shalt remain, in midst of other woe
Than ours, a friend to man, to whom thou say'st,
Beauty is truth, truth beauty."²

True, this reading increases man's "needed" knowledge a bit further (as would the assumption that the antecedent of the pronoun "that" is the whole poem), but surely the comma and the dash do not necessarily indicate a remote antecedent for the pronoun. The punctuation may just as well indicate a return from the urn's truth-beauty ultimatum to the poet's ultimatum about the urn—the object he has been addressing throughout the poem.

I cannot see that the reading I favor alters the position of those critics who insist that the aphorism must be limited to the experience generated within the context of the poem and not applied to all human knowledge, except perhaps when applied to all human knowledge representing aesthetically imaginative insight. For after all there is a startlingly direct address to man on the part of the urn. I freely agree with Mr. Cleanth Brooks that if the urn "has been properly dramatized . . . then we shall be prepared for the enigmatic final paradox which the 'silent form' utters." In which case, "we shall not feel that the generalization, unqualified and to be taken literally, is meant to march out of its context to compete with the scientific and philosophical generalizations which dominate our world."³ Unfortunately, the generalization does march out of context if we take the closing words to be a challenge addressed to man about all human knowledge, and this will always tease us out of thought. In the words of Mr. Bernard Berenson:

We must not glide or slip, or still less leap from ideated to real sensations, from art to actuality For the ideated sensations that constitute the work

² Wasserman, *The Finer Tone* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1953), p. 60.

³ Cleanth Brooks, *The Well Wrought Urn* (New York, 1947), p. 151.

of art belong to a realm apart, a realm beyond actuality where the ideal is the only reality, a realm of contemplation, of "emotion recollected in tranquillity," a realm where nothing can happen except to the soul of the spectator, and nothing that is not tempering and refining.⁴

Fortunately, however, if we take it that Keats is wisely addressing the closing words of his poem to the urn, we find the aphorism restricted to the urn as a representative of the ideated realm of aesthetic insight, which should be world enough. The poem then remains an ode "on" a Grecian urn.

North Carolina State College

PORTER WILLIAMS, JR.

Hopkins's "wings that spell" in *The Wreck of the Deutschland*¹

In Part I of Hopkins's *The Wreck of the Deutschland*, the narrator's description of his religious experience is repeatedly expressed in terms of the heart. Stanza three, for example, thus describes his frantic search for sanctuary from Christ's wrath:

The frown of his face
Before me, the hurtle of hell
Behind, where, where was a, where was a place?
I whirled out wings that spell
And fled with a fling of the heart to the heart of the Host.
My heart, but you were dovewinged, I can tell,
Carrier-witted, I am bold to boast,
To flash from the flame to the flame then, tower from the grace to the grace.²

The word *spell* in line four has caused some discussion. Both

⁴ Bernard Berenson, *Aesthetics and History* (New York, 1954), p. 77.

¹ Excerpt from microcarded doctoral dissertation by Sister Mary Adorita Hart, B. V. M., *The Christocentric Theme in Gerard Manley Hopkins's "The Wreck of the Deutschland"* (The Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1952), pp. 53-55.

² W. H. Gardner, ed., *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (3rd ed.; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1948), "The Wreck of the Deutschland," No. 28, pp. 55-67. For Hopkins's use of the heart-image, see not only his entire ode but also *Poems* Nos. 36, 38, 53, 55, 68, 69, 70, 71; and Humphrey House, ed., *The Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1937), p. 297.

W. H. Gardner³ and W. A. M. Peters, S. J.,⁴ explicate it as a noun. Robert Boyle, S. J., however, construes the word as a verb: he says that "the image spells something, is significant, probably because the bird with extended wings forms a cross."⁵

A verb seems more satisfactory within the syntactic context of line four, but certain objective data resist a static definition of *spell* such as Father Boyle's. Would not Hopkins probably have chosen a verb matching the dynamism of *whirled* and *fled* and the phrase, "a fling of the heart"? He is careful to make his patterns of imagery and sound function organically. The strong upward movement implied in the image of the winged heart is so noticeably underscored by "rising feet,"⁶ that one's voice almost instinctively emphasizes *spell* and gives to it the same "lift" that is given to *fled*.

Admittedly an interpreter meets his primary difficulty in the cold fact that dictionaries nowhere give this precise form as a verb with a meaning relevant to *The Deutschland*. A more indirect approach to the word fortunately leads to a definition which actually meets the text's puzzling demands.

NED gives the verb *speel* as meaning "to mount or ascend to a height by climbing." As Scottish and North dialect forms, it gives the variant spellings: *speil*; *spiel*; *spel*.⁷ Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary* also says that *speel* ("to climb or to ascend") is written *speil* in Scottish and North Welsh dialects; this is also written *spiel*.⁸ What is important is that Wright also gives the variant form *spel* and points out that *spel*, in North Wales and east Lancashire, is sometimes written *spell*.⁹

If, then, *spel* (or *spell*) is a variant of *speel*, and if *speel* means "to mount or to ascend," there really was available to Hopkins for

³ *Poems*, p. 222: "in that brief bout." See discussion in Gardner, *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Study of Poetic Idiosyncrasy in Relation to Poetic Tradition*, Vol. I (Yale Univ. Press, 1948), p. 54. Note in recent Penguin Press print of Gardner's 3rd ed. of *Poems* is substantially the same: "period of stress."

⁴ W. A. M. Peters, S. J., *Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1948), p. 157. *Spell* is read as "time."

⁵ Robert R. Boyle, S. J., "The Thought Structure of 'The Wreck of the Deutschland,'" *Immortal Diamond: Studies in Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Norman Weyand, S. J. (New York, 1949), p. 335.

⁶ "... feet and rhythms in which the slack comes first are called Rising Feet and Rhythms . . ." (Author's Preface, *Poems*, p. 5).

⁷ "Speel," Vol. IX, I, p. 567.

⁸ Joseph Wright, *The English Dialect Dictionary* (New York, 1904), Vol. V, p. 655.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *spel*, p. 657. Variant spelling given: *spiel*. Comment following *spell*: "also written *spel* in n. Cy. e. Lan."

use in his *Deutschland* this strikingly accurate if now unfamiliar dialect verb.

Not that this is tantamount to establishing that Hopkins's *spell* in *The Deutschland* actually is this verb. Nowhere else in his prose or poetry is *spell* used in this fashion; nowhere is there available a handy check upon his awareness of the dialect verb. But Hopkins's alertness to the current Welsh language is too well known to need further comment. The text of *The Deutschland* therefore amply justifies the conjecture that his quick ear may have caught and his quick mind have recognized in this dialect verb, *spell*, a perfect word for conveying the exact thought he wishes to express in his heart-image at this point of his poem. His text is here presenting in his image of the "dovewinged heart" an allusion to the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit to help the soul rise to closer union with Christ.¹⁰

Hopkins's "wings that spell," interpreted as "wings that mount, that ascend, that climb," at least presents an image which satisfies the exigencies of his thought structure to a degree not to be found in the readings of *spell* thus far advanced. Of course, what reading he himself had in mind must of necessity, at least for the present, remain an "interesting uncertainty."

Clarke College

SISTER MARY ADORITA, B. V. M.

A Defense of the Ending of Cooper's *The Crater*

In 1886, Charles F. Richardson denounced as "preposterous" the denouement of James Fenimore Cooper's political allegory, *The Crater: or, Vulcan's Peak* (1847).¹ In 1947, H. H. Scudder declared that the ending of the novel would be preposterous if Cooper were assumed to be serious in it, but "Cooper was, of course, *not* serious and would have been much surprised to know that any one could so take him."² In 1949, James Grossman, Cooper's latest biographer, took the ending of the novel seriously and condemned it thus: "We

¹⁰ For Hopkins's fuller prose treatment of this doctrinal theme, see *Note-Books*, pp. 287, 289. Also the passage from one of his unpublished sermons, quoted by Selma Jeanne Cohen, "Hopkins' As Kingfishers Catch Fire," *MLQ*, xi (1950), 203-4. Typescript, made at Campion Hall, Oxford, is in the University of Chicago library.

¹ *American Literature* (New York, 1886), II, 309.

² "Cooper's *The Crater*," *AL*, xix (1947), 109-126.

resent the judgment in *The Crater* because it is presented not as the novelist's but as the judgment of the divine will, for the moment no longer inscrutable, passed on mankind when it violates Cooper's laws of the universe."³

However, if Cooper's evident purpose and his sources are taken into account, the denouement of *The Crater* no longer seems preposterous; it was undoubtedly meant to be taken seriously; and it affords no grounds for resentment.

Upon his return in 1833 from seven years' residence in Europe, Cooper was shocked by what he considered the degradation of democracy at the hands of demagogues, and his barrage of criticism naturally brought reprisals. In 1834, in *A Letter to His Countrymen*, and thereafter in other works, his "hurt pride," as Robert E. Spiller has well said, "contended with the righteous wrath of the injured prophet."⁴ From such a background came *The Crater*, a social and political allegory in which Cooper obviously paralleled the founding, the development, and (as he saw it) the deterioration of his beloved country.

The principal action of the novel takes place on a Pacific island, where, under the wise guidance of Mark Woolston, who represents Cooper's conception of the "gentleman," farming and industry are begun, hostile natives are subdued, and a stable government is established. All goes well in this idyllic colony until demagogues finally succeed in ousting the so-called "aristocratic" Woolston from office. Thereupon, Woolston and his family return to the United States. Some time later, when they attempt to revisit the once prosperous colony, they find only the tip of one small island. The land and the inhabitants thereof have been swallowed up by the ocean. It is this destruction of the land and the people that has provoked such diverse comments.

It must be remembered that Cooper thought of himself as an injured prophet, a voice crying in the wilderness of demagoguery, and that *The Crater* is a social and political allegory. In the preface to the novel is this expression of his "darker purpose" in the book and, consequently, its denouement: "If those who now live in this republic, can see any grounds for a timely warning in the events here recorded, it may happen that the mercy of a divine Creator may still preserve that which he has hitherto cherished and protected." This

³ James Fenimore Cooper (New York, 1949), p. 225.

⁴ Fenimore Cooper, *Critic of His Times* (New York, 1931), p. 226.

is precisely the manner of an Old Testament prophet or of the words of the Lord in Ezekiel: "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he has committed and keep my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die." In picturing the destruction of the colony after the removal of the chosen ones, the Woolston family, Cooper was clearly using other Biblical material—the story of the saving of Noah and his family from the Flood and the preservation of Lot from the destruction laid on Sodom and Gomorrah.

Viewed thus in the light of Cooper's mission as a prophet and of his Biblical sources, the destruction of the colony is not preposterous; it is not a mere device for ending the story, as Scudder held; it is something to be taken seriously. It is Prophet Cooper's warning of what may befall the American nation unless it repents of its sins in permitting demagogues to overthrow the ideals of true democracy. Thus the denouement of *The Crater* is both effective and artistically necessary in terms of Cooper's role as a prophet in this allegorical study of the nation.

That Cooper really meant something by the denouement of the novel and that the foregoing interpretation is correct is further suggested by the words he used about *The Crater* in a letter to his wife: "I like my new book exceedingly, and the part which I was afraid is ill done, is the best done. I mean the close. Altogether it is a remarkable book, and ought to make a noise."⁵

Texas Technological College

W. B. GATES

William Faulkner and Sir Philip Sidney?

In *Pylon*, one of William Faulkner's lesser novels, the phrase "Nilebarge clatterfalque" occurs several times.¹ It constitutes an ironic and perhaps excessively compressed description of one of the

⁵ *Correspondence of James Fenimore Cooper*, edited by his grandson, James Fenimore Cooper (New Haven, 1922), II, 574. *The Crater* is, as Cooper said, "a remarkable book," especially in its artistic assimilation of a wide variety of sources. Besides Professor Scudder's article already mentioned, see the present writer's studies dealing with some other sources of *The Crater*: *PMLA*, LXVI, 1069-1075; *AL*, XXIII, 243-246; and *MLN*, LXVII, 421-422.

¹ *Pylon* (New York, 1935), pp. 77, 202, 209.

floats in the Mardi Gras celebration that serves as background for the main action of the story. The strangeness of the phrase is intensified with its first appearance, for the float and, by inference, the entire festival is referred to as "Momus' Nilebarge clatterfalque" (p. 77).

At first sight, this collocation of Momus and the Nile appears to be Faulkner's own invention. However, a rather strikingly similar use of the two terms occurs in Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry*. Sidney warns his readers: "but if (fie of such a but) you be borne so neere the dull making *Cataphracht* of *Nilus* that you cannot heare the Plannet-like Musick of Poetrie, if you have so earth-creeping a mind that it cannot lift it selfe up to looke to the sky of Poetry, or rather, by a certain rusticall disdaine, will become such a Mome as to be a *Momus* of Poetry."²

Whether this passage actually constitutes the source for the phrase in *Pylon* is uncertain, for it is quite possible that the similarity is merely coincidental. Nevertheless, there is a sufficient measure of intrinsic probability for the relationship to be regarded as an interesting though tentative hypothesis with implications both for Faulkner's reading habits and for his literary techniques.

University of Tennessee

JOHN B. VICKERY

Heine's Poem "Ein Fräulein stand am Meere"

The poems which Heine published in his second collection of poetry (*Neue Gedichte*, 1844) under the headings *Neuer Frühling* and *Verschiedene* and which had mostly been printed before in various journals and in his *Salon*, found, on the whole, a rather cool reception at the hands of contemporary and later critics. This, it seems to me, was due to the fact that they were read with the pattern of the *Buch der Lieder* (1827) in mind, which had once for all made his manner as well as his mannerisms famous. But since that publication Heine had matured, his attitude toward life had taken on new facets, and while this was generally recognized for his prose, where it was clearly expressed—as in his espousal of Saint-Simonian ideas—it

² *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. G. Smith (Oxford, 1904), I, 206-207.

has not been sufficiently observed as a background of the poems in question, some of which were written in the thirties.

A good example of this is "Seraphine X," which ridicules the sentimentality of a young lady who melts in tears at the sight of the setting sun and is reminded of the fact that this is a daily spectacle and that the sun will reappear every morning from the opposite side. This sounds much like the description of the Brocken excursionists in Heine's *Harzreise* (1826; see *Werke*, ed. Elster, 2nd edition, III, 353). However, the poem reveals a more important meaning when we compare it with a passage in Heine's *Romantische Schule* (ibid., v, 268), first printed March, April and May 1833 in *L'Europe Littéraire*, while the poem had appeared in *Der Freimütige*, February 14 of the same year.

The connection between prose passage and poem needs no further elaboration when we read:

Friedrich Schlegel was a man of deep thought. He felt all the sufferings of the present, but he did not comprehend the sacredness of these sufferings in so far as they are necessary for the future salvation of the world. He observed the sun going down, gazed mournfully at the place of its setting and bemoaned the nocturnal darkness which he saw approaching; but he did not notice that already a new dawn was lighting up the opposite side of the sky. Friedrich Schlegel once called the historian an inverted prophet. This completely characterizes him. He hated the present, the future frightened him and it was into the past, which he loved, that his revealing prophet's eye penetrated. Poor Friedrich Schlegel, in the sufferings of our time he did not see the pains of a regeneration, but the agony of death, and in his mortal anguish he fled into the trembling ruins of the Catholic Church.

The Johns Hopkins University

ERNST FEISE

Voltaire and the Printer, Walther

George Conrad Walther came from Nuremberg, where he was born, to Dresden to accept a position with the book purveyor to the royal court, Friedrich Heckel, about 1736. He was ambitious and his progress was fairly rapid. In 1740 he bought out his father-in-law's shop and was destined in time to become Printer to the Court.¹

¹ See F. A. Ebert, *Überlieferungen zur Geschichte, Literatur, und Kunst der Vor- und Mitwelt* (Dresden, 1826), Vol. I, part 1, p. 85.

He had given satisfactory service to Count Algarotti; and the latter, at his urging, wrote Voltaire on December 11, 1746, in part as follows:²

Il sig. Walther, librajò della corte qui ni Dresde, che è un onestissimo uomo, amator delle arti, . . . vorria stampare le vostre opere, e mi ha pregato di farvi sapere questo suo desiderio.

Algarotti requests this as a personal favor, adding that Walther would accept any conditions Voltaire saw fit to impose. In due course Voltaire authorized Algarotti to act as his agent with Walther. Thus did a cosmopolitan Italian bring a French author into contact with a German publisher who was destined to print several of Voltaire's single works and to issue some editions of the complete works. He was further to serve Voltaire in borrowing for him in Dresden source books for his *Siècle de Louis XIV.*

The correspondence between author and publisher has never been fully published, although its existence has been a matter of knowledge for a long time. Friedrich Adolf Ebert used the letters for an article: "Ungedruckte Briefe von Voltaire" in his previously mentioned *Überlieferungen* where approximately sixty are referred to and some given *in toto*. Beuchot reveals, in a letter cited by Bengesco,³ that he had access to them:

Ces lettres sont au nombre de soixante-neuf: il y avait en outre trois autres pièces ou fragments inédits.

Beuchot chose not to publish them all and thereby won censure from Bengesco. Although "une note manuscrite de Beuchot, donnant la date de ces soixante-neuf lettres avec l'indication des premiers et derniers mots de chacune d'elles" exists in the Beuchot collection, it was apparently not used by the late Professor Delattre.⁴ His data came from Ebert, but unfortunately he did not use all the data available there. Aside from a stray sentence from letters for which Ebert gave no date and which could be incorporated only with difficulty into Delattre's *répertoire*, there are some for which a date is given which should appear there. They are as follows:

² *Opere del conte Algarotti* (Venice, 1794), Vol. XVI, p. 95.

³ *Voltaire: Bibliographie de ses œuvres* (Paris, 1880), III, 223.

⁴ André Delattre, *Répertoire chronologique des Lettres de Voltaire* (Chapel Hill, 1952).

1) A letter dated December 21, 1752, containing the phrase:⁶ "Je vous prie de me dire si le Sr. Bacular (sic) d'Arnaud est encore à Dresde."

2) A letter dated March 30, 1753.⁶

It was my good fortune to find one more, apparently still unpublished.⁷ It is dated "Cleves juillet," but a foreign hand has inserted the figure "14." It appears to have been written in the month of July 1750 (when the author was on his fateful trip to Berlin) from Cleves where he spent a fortnight waiting for horses to carry him further.

a cleves 14 juillet

je vous prie de m'envoyer monsieur par les voitures publiques huit exemplaires de mes oeuvres a berlin à l'adresse de M^r darget conseiller privé secretaire du roy de prusse. j'espère vous voir bientôt a dresde a mon retour, et ne vous y etre pas inutile. tout à vous

Voltaire

A Monsieur

Monsieur Walthera (sic)

libraire du roy de pologne

a Dresden (sic)

Voltaire's generosity extended to the point of making a gift of his works to Walther.⁸ The German was planning to return the favor by a gift of *porcelaine de Saxe*, but the author headed off the action by a polite letter declining the gift. Friendly relations seem to have continued until at least 1756, when the Cramer relationship was firmly established.⁹

University of California
Los Angeles

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

⁶ Ebert, *o. c.*, p. 120.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

⁷ I wish to express here by gratitude to Yale University for permission to publish it.

⁸ Moland xv, 129 (data first published by Walther himself).

⁹ Referring to the *Annales de l'Empire*, Ebert gives (on page 123) a sentence:

J'ai tâché surtout de rendre ce livre utile aux jeunes gens, je le crois exacte (sic), et on me flatte qu'il pourrait être nécessaire à l'éducation de la noblesse d'Allemagne.

as belonging to a letter dated January 13, 1754. Is Ebert here in error as to the date? In any case, the sentence is lacking in Moland under that date.

The Spanish Translations of Alciato's *Emblemata*

Not many years after the publication of the *editio princeps* (1531) of Alciato's *Emblemata*, the first Spanish version was printed in Lyons in 1549. The translator was a certain Bernardino Daza and the work was entitled as follows: *Los emblemas de Alciato traducidos en rhimas españolas* (Lyon: Gulielmo Rovillio, 1549). Another edition was prepared by Bonhomme in Lyons in the same year, but except for the title page there is no significant difference between the two editions, Bonhomme and Rouillé having shared the edition, a practice very common then and especially between these two printers and book dealers.¹

We have relatively little biographical information about Bernardino Daza. A native of Valladolid, where he was baptized in 1528, he was a brother of the famous surgeon Dionisio Daza Chacón, who is mentioned by Cervantes in the "Canto de Calíope" of *La Galatea*.² From the *prefación* (p. 12) to the *Emblemas*, it appears that Bernardino Daza was a student or friend of Hernán Núñez Pinciano:

... nuestro unico restituidor de la antigüedad [que tal nombre le damos en estos reynos] con aquellos sus doctísimos comentarios sobre las trecientas del de Mena, que con no se poder mejorar, le oy dezir muchas vezes que diera vna gran cosa por poderlos todos quemar de tal manera que no sonara mas en ellos su nombre.

Our translator received his *bachillerato* in 1547, became a *licenciado en leyes* in 1555 and was awarded the doctorate in 1566. In 1576 he is known to have been a professor of law at the University of Valladolid. Besides his translation of the *Emblemata*, he wrote a translation and treatise on the Justinian code, *Las instituciones imperiales, o principios del derecho civil* (Tolosa de Francia: Guion Bodeville, 1551),³ and a Latin epigram of his was included in his brother's *Pratica y teorica de cirugia*.⁴

Nicolás Antonio assigns the date of 1540 to Daza's translation of

¹ Henri Louis Baudrier, *Bibliographie Lyonnaise* (Lyon, 1912), neuvième série, p. 167: "Edition partagée entre G. Rouillé et M. Bonhomme."

² Consult ed. Schevill-Bonilla (Madrid, 1914), II, pp. 215, 311.

³ Other editions: (Salamanca: Diego de Casio, 1614); (Salamanca: Antonia Ramirez, 1627); (Manila: Gerónimo Correa de Castro, 1737); Madrid: Lorenzo Francisco Mojados, 1724); consult also M. Menéndez Pelayo, *Biblioteca hispano-latina clásica*, ed. nacional (Santander, 1951), VII, 10-11, 15-16.

⁴ Narciso Alonso Cortés, *Noticias de una corte literaria* (Madrid-Valladolid, 1906), pp. 7-9; id., *Miscelánea vallisoletana* (Valladolid, 1921), tercera serie, pp. 64, 106-111.

the *Emblemata*, an edition considered apocryphal by Henry Green.⁵ If we are to give credence to the biographical data furnished by Narciso Alonso Cortés, it is most improbable for Bernardino Daza to have done the translation at that date, since he would have been only twelve years old.

There is, however, rather reasonable assurance that Bernardino Daza had written a Latin commentary previous to his Spanish translation of the *Emblemata*. In the dedicatory letter to Juan Vázquez de Molina, he states: "dias passados compusse Las Enarraciones Latinas sobre estos mesmos Emblemas de Alciato, las quales à v. m. dirigi estando yo en esa corte de España" (p. 7). We also learn from the *prefación* that his Latin commentary was a very literal one, "auiendo yo declarado en mis Latinas Enarraciones este librito verso por verso" (p. 14). It was divided into two parts called "libros," a practice he also followed in the translation, for the reason that "La longura de vno solo no fuesse fastidioso" (p. 15). Furthermore, he promises a translation into Greek.

Bernardino Daza went to Toulouse and to other parts of France to study law for a period of two years (1549-51). After his arrival, he claims to have found a copy of the *Emblemata* "corregido y aumentado de otros muchos . . . de la mano del mesmo Alciato" (*prefación*, p. 12). He further states that since the work had been translated into "casi toda otra lengua," but not into Spanish, he undertook the task as a pastime and in order not to forget his native language, admitting that he spent very little time doing the translation. The *Emblemata*, like the *Adagia* of Erasmus, passed through various stages of elaboration before reaching the definitive form to which we usually refer as *flumen abundans*, or full stream. There is no particular reason why one should doubt Daza's allegation of having seen a copy of the *Emblemata* with additions or emendations by Alciato. After the Aldine edition of 1546, Bonhomme and Rouillé prepared a series of editions from 1548 to 1551 inclusive, four crucial years in the development of the *Emblemata*. The number of emblems varied in each version. For example, the Latin edition of 1548 by Rouillé contains 201 emblems and 129 devices, the French edition by Bon-

⁵ *Andreae Alciati Emblematum Flumen abundans*, ed. Henry Green (London-Manchester: Holbein Society, 1871), p. 1. Paul Émile Viard (*André Alciato, 1492-1550* [Bordeaux, 1926], p. 321) lists Spanish versions dated 1540 and 1542, but without any bibliographical or other foundation. J. A. Van Praag, "Los fondos españoles de las bibliotecas de Holanda," *Clavileño*, v (1954), p. 11, cites an edition of *Los emblemas de Alciato* dated 1548.

homme (1549) 201 emblems and 165 devices, the Spanish version under consideration 212 emblems and 201 devices,⁶ Marquale's Italian version (Rouillé, 1551) 180 emblems and devices, and the definitive version in Latin of 1551 by Bonhomme 211 emblems and devices.⁷

Unlike his supposed Latin commentary, Daza's Spanish translation is not a literal one. The translator preferred to accompany the emblems with verses of a variety of forms, which he calls "coplas a la Italiana." He justifies the word "rhimas" in the title by stating that "ansi llaman ellos [los italianos] sus coplas." Bernardino Daza decided to choose different verse forms, especially *ovtavas*, *sonetos*, and *tercetos*, to interpret the general meaning and intent of each emblem, imitating in this use of a variety of strophic forms the practice established by Alciato. For each emblem, Daza usually identifies the verse form used in the margin, and when the commentary is in dialogue, he assigns the proper interlocutors.

Quadrio⁸ also refers to a Spanish translation published by Giolito. The existence of such an edition is highly questionable, but one does not care to refute altogether the information offered by this historian of Italian literature. Giolito in collaboration with Alonso de Ulloa⁹ was responsible for the diffusion of many Spanish books in Italy about the middle of the sixteenth century. It is quite possible that Giolito obtained copies of the *Emblemata* from Rouillé, the publisher of the Spanish translation of 1549, but that he substituted his own title page. It is doubtful that Giolito published a Spanish translation using his own illustrations, for the Venetian publisher was very much in the habit of utilizing them at later dates for related works. No books published by Giolito have illustrations traceable to an edition of the *Emblemata*.¹⁰

The only other Spanish commentary to Alciato's *Emblemata* is the following: *Declaracion magistral sobre las Emblemas de Alciato*

⁶ Daza added two emblems of his own, one dedicated to Juan Vázquez de Molina, the other in honor of Doña Marina de Aragón.

⁷ Consult *Emblematum Flumen abundans*, ed. cit., pp. 1-22. Green also collated the titles and mottoes of the editions cited. The designation of two separate numbers, one of emblems, the other of devices, means that the edition contains a number of "nude" emblems, that is, emblems without corresponding devices. Thus the following are not illustrated in Daza's version: pp. 162, 164, 173, 174 (two), 177, 184, 210, 213, 229 (two).

⁸ Francesco Saverio Quadrio, *Della storia e della ragione d'ogni poesia* (Bologna: I. Pissarri, 1739-44), III, 419.

⁹ The present writer has in progress an extensive study on Alonso de Ulloa.

¹⁰ Salvatore Bonghi, *Annali di Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari da Trino di Monferrato Stampatore in Venezia* (Rome, 1890), I, 271-272. Giolito's edition is not cited by Eduart Toda y Güell, *Bibliografia Espanyola d'Italia*.

con todas las Historias, Antiquedades, Moralidad y Doctrina tocante a las buenas Costumbres (Por Diego Lopez . . ., Najera, Iuan de Mongastón, 1615). The commentator was a native of Valencia de Alcántara, and teacher and preceptor of grammar and Latin, which he taught in Toro and Olmedo in the years 1611 and 1620. Friend of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, to whom the first edition of the *Declaración* is dedicated, he also translated and wrote a commentary on the works of Virgil, Juvenal, Aulus Persius Flaccus, and Valerius Maximus.¹¹ There were at least three other editions of the *Declaración magistral sobre las Emblemas de Alciato*: Valencia, Gerónimo Vilagrassa, 1655; 1670; *ibid.*; Francisco Mestre, 1684.¹² Diego López reproduces the motto, engraving, and Latin poem of the standard edition and text of the *Emblemata*, interpreting in great detail but in a straightforward fashion the historical and mythological background of each emblem and its symbolism. As in some of the subsequent Latin versions of the *Emblemata* published in Spain, he gives the motto in Latin and not in Greek (e.g., nos. 16, 17, 34). There is no essential difference in the text or number of emblems explained in the four editions cited. That of 1684, no longer dedicated to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, but to Antonio Folch de Cardona, does not bear the name of the translator either on the title page or in any other place throughout the text. But in "El Autor a los Lectores" he mentions his translations of Virgil and Aulus Persius. This, together with the fact that the text is identical with that of previous editions, clearly indicates that the author was the same

¹¹ *Las obras de Publio Virgilio Marón. Traduzido en prosa castellana por Diego Lopez . . . Con comento y anotaciones* (Valladolid, 1601; Madrid, 1614; Alcalá, 1650; Madrid, 1657; Madrid, 1668); *Declaración magistral sobre las sátiras de Juvenal* (Madrid, 1642); *Aulo Persio Flacco. Traduzido en lengua castellana por Diego Lopez* (Burgos, 1609); *Los nueve libros de los exemplos y virtudes morales de Valerio Máximo, traduzidos y comentados en lengua castellana por D. Lopez* (Madrid, 1655; Sevilla, 1631). Consult also Antonio Rodríguez Moñino, *Virgilio en España. Ensayo bibliográfico sobre las traducciones de Diego López, 1600-1721* (Badajoz: Centro de estudios extremeños, 1930); M. Menéndez Pelayo, *op. cit.*, VIII, 180, 184-187, 204-205, 372-373; IX, 202.

¹² Consult José Enrique Serrano y Morales, *Diccionario de las imprentas que han existido en Valencia* (Valencia, 1898-99), p. 284. Palau (*Manual* . . ., ed. 1948, I, 173) lists also the following: *Emblemas . . . con notas latinas por José Campos* (Valencia: Herederos de Gerónimo Vilagrassa, 1676). We have not been able to locate a copy of this work. Joseph Campos contributed a dedicatory poem to the 1655 edition of the *Declaración magistral* of Diego López. See also Justo Pastor Fuster, *Biblioteca Valenciana de los escritores que florecieron hasta nuestros días* (Valencia, 1827), I, 267: ". . . al principio de esta edición hay un epigrama del mismo Campos, que acredita en mucha naturalidad y fluidez en la poesía latina."

Diego López. The translator evidently places Alciato on the same level as the classical authors. His interest is primarily in the fable, anecdote, history, and antiquity, with emphasis on the moral and doctrinal aspect of the work. This same significance is also attached to his other works and translations.¹³

Before concluding this discussion of the Spanish translations of the *Emblemata* it is pertinent to cite briefly the Latin commentaries and editions published in Spain (or by Spanish authors), of which the most important is that of the humanist Francisco Sánchez el Brocense. The editions are the following:

Francisci Sanctii Brocensis . . . comment. in And. Alciati Emblemata, nunc denuo multis in locis accurate recognita, & quamplurimus figuris illustrata (Lugduni, apud Guliel. Rovillium, 1573).

A. Alciati emblemata. Cum commentariis C. Minois, F. Sanctii, et notis Pignorii . . . (Patavii, 1621).

Opera omnia cum ejusdem scriptoris vita, auctore G. Maiansio (Genevae, 1776, t. iii).¹⁴

A Latin version of the *Emblemata* was published in Mexico by Antonio Ricardo as follows:

Omnia Domini Andreae Alciati Emblemata (Mexici, In Collegio Sanctorum Petri & Pauli, apud Antonium Ricardum, 1577). [Copy in Newberry Library, Chicago].

Licenses by the Viceroy D. Martín Enríquez de Almanza and the Archbishop D. Pedro Moya de Contreras dated February 16, 1577, and December 24, 1576, respectively¹⁵ authorized Antonio Ricardo to print for the Society of Jesus for instructional purposes in their schools the *Emblemata* of Alciato. These licenses also extend to books on rhetoric and orthography and to the works of such classical authors as Virgil, Cicero and Ovid. Unfortunately, very few books from the press of Antonio Ricardo have been preserved.¹⁶

¹³ Cf. "Al Lector" to Aulo Persio Flacco. Traduzido en lengua castellana (Burgos, 1609).

¹⁴ Nicolás Antonio lists an edition of the *Commentaria* of 1563, which, however, we have not been able to locate.

¹⁵ We find these licenses included and printed with *Introductio in Dialecticam Aristotelis* (1578).

¹⁶ Consult Joaquín García Icazbalceta, *Bibliografía mexicana del siglo XVI, primera parte* (Mexico, 1886), pp. 212-213, 229; José Toribio Medina, *La imprenta en Mexico, 1539-1821* (Santiago de Chile, 1909), I, 212, no. 77; *Bibliotheca Mexicana or a Catalogue of the Library of Rare Books and Important Manuscripts relating to Mexico and to other Parts of Spanish America, formed by the late don José Fernando Ramírez. . . . To be Sold by Auction,*

There are recorded five other editions in Latin of the *Emblemata* (all containing 211 emblems) which were published in Spain:

Emblemata . . . (Valencia, 1654).

V. C. Andreae Alciati Mediolanensis Juris Consulti, *Emblemata cum facile & compendiosa explicatione, qua obscura illustrantur, dubiaeque omnia solvuntur per Claudium Minoem Divisionem. Eiusdem Alciati Vita* (Matriti, 1733). [Introduction by Claude Minois dated 1583; copy: NYPL].

Idem; Edictio novissima a mendis expurgata, & auctoris autographo collata V.C.D.D. Blessio Antonio (Madrid, 1735).

Idem. (Madrid, Tip. ord. Mercedes, 1749).

Emblemata V. C. Andreae Alciati . . . cum facile et compendiosa explicatione, qua obscura illustrantur, dubiaeque omnia solvuntur, per Claudium Minoem Divisionem. Editio novissima a mendis expurgata, priorique integritati restituta (Matriti, Ex Typographia Pantaleonis Aznar, 1781). [The aprobation is dated Nov. 11, 1621; copy: UXT].

There exists also a partial Latin commentary in manuscript (Ms 6. 658, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid): *Joannis Valentiae . . . scholia in Andreae Alciati emblemata*. The text is not illustrated and Juan Valencia merely commented on 71 emblems.¹⁷

The Johns Hopkins University

KARL LUDWIG SELIG

by Messrs. Puttick and Simpson (London, 1880), pp. 4, 9; Miguel Cascón, *Los jesuitas en Menéndez Pelayo* (Valladolid, 1940), pp. 216-218; K. L. Selig, "The Spanish Translation of Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*," *Italica*, xxviii (1951), 254-256. It is of interest to note that Alciato's *Emblemata* as well as other emblem books were shipped to the New World at an early date; see Otis H. Green and Irving A. Leonard, "On the Mexican Booktrade in 1600: A Chapter in Cultural History," *HR*, ix (1941), 1-40; Irving A. Leonard, "On the Mexican Booktrade, 1576," *HR*, xvii (1949), 18-34; also Prof. Leonard's *Books of the Brave* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), pp. 255-256.

¹⁷ See Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca* . . . II, 167. Salvá (*Catálogo de la biblioteca de Salvá* [Valencia, 1872], I, 172) mentions the following work which includes translation of the poetry of Alciato: *Poesías selectas de varios autores latinos traducidos en versos castellanos e ilustradas con notas de la erudición que encierran por el Padre Joseph Morell* (Taragona: Joseph Soler, 1683). The book is also listed by Palau, *Manual* . . . , ed. 1926, V, 245. Alciato's *De singulari certamine liber* had a Spanish translation: *De la manera de desafio, traducido de latin en romance castellano por Iuan Martin Cordero* . . . (Anvers: M. Nucio [1558]). For this work consult Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne* (Paris, 1937), p. 763, and Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín, "Erasmus en España," *Revue Hispanique*, xvii (1907), 502-506. Felix de Latassa, *Bibliotecas antigua y nueva de escritores aragoneses* . . . (Zaragoza, 1885), II, 457-461 refers to a manuscript by Juan Lorenzo Palmireno entitled *Annotaciones in Alciatum*. Palmireno is also supposed to have written a prologue to an edition (in Greek) of the *Hieroglyphica* of Horo Apollo by Pedro Puig de Becete. This information found in Latassa is repeated by Caro Lynn, "Juan Lorenzo Palmireno, Spanish Humanist," *Hispania*, xii (1929), 243-258.

A Latin Poem of Ariosto in Spanish

When the Don Fernando of Lope de Vega's *Dorotea* is surprised to learn that Ariosto had written Latin verse, Ludovico explains: "Mucio Justinopolitano cita un epitafio suyo al marqués de Pescara, que se opone diametralmente a quantos hay escritos.¹" My search through available works of Girolamo Muzio has not revealed the source of the allusion, which, to be sure, need not be found in any work of Muzio himself.

The epitaph, on the other hand, is by no means impossible to come by. I copy it from the Fatini edition:²

Piscarii Epitaphium

Chi giace sotto questo freddo marmo?

—Quis iacet hoc gelido sub marmore?—Maximus ille piscator, belli gloria, pacis honos.—

Nunquid et hic pisces cepit?—Non.—Ergo quid?—Urbes, magnanimos reges, oppida, regna, duces.—

Dic quibus haec cepit piscator retibus?—Alto consilio, intrepido corde, alacrique manu.—

Qui tantum rapuere ducem?—Duo numina: Mars, Mors.— Ut raperent quidnam compulit?—Invidia.—

Cui nocuere?—Sibi; vivit nam fama superstes, quae Martem et Mortem vincit et Invidiam.

Fatini's list³ of earlier editions of the lyrics includes several in which this and Ariosto's other Latin poems may be examined, together with some that might have been examined by Lope de Vega. At all events, owing to his affiliations and his military successes in the Spanish cause, Pescara's name was long a glorious one in Spain, enhanced, there as elsewhere, by the faithful devotion of his wife Vittoria Colonna. And Ariosto's epitaph did not pass unnoticed in that country.

It is not a great poem. Carducci would have preferred to consider it spurious; or, failing that, to regard it as written with tongue in cheek.⁴ We do not know Lope's opinion of it—, if he actually found it entire and not simply mentioned. But its ingenious question and answer form and elaborate wordplay obviously impressed his compatriots. I know three Spanish versions, enough to suggest the possi-

¹ Edition of Américo Castro (Madrid, 1913), p. 142, 4-6.

² Ludovico Ariosto, *Lirica* (Bari, 1924), p. 231.

³ *Ibid.*, especially pp. 330-332.

⁴ Pp. 232-233 of the essay "La gioventù di Ludovico Ariosto e la poesia latina in Ferrara," in *Opere*, xv (Bologna, 1905).

bility of more. The earliest and most strictly literal appears, accompanied by the original, in the *Historia de don Hernando Dávalos, Marqués de Pescara*, by P. Valles:⁵

¿Quién está tendido baxo deste mármol frío?
Aquel gran Pescador, gloria de la guerra, honra de la paz.
¿Por ventura tomó también éste pescas? No. Pues ¿qué?
Ciudades, reyes magnánimos, castillos, reynos, capitanes.
Dez! ¿con qué redes prendió estas cosas el Pescador?
Con alto consejo, con valeroso corazón y con mano animosa.
¿Quién arrebató tan gran capitán? Dos deidades: Mars, la Muerte.
¿Qué les forçó para arrebatarlo? La Inuidia.
En ninguna cosa⁶ le nozieron, porque la fama que queda viue;
La qual vence a Mars, la Muerte y la Embidia.

Next comes an octave in Canto XXVI of D. Luis Zapata's *Carlo famoso* (1566):

¿Quién está en esta piedra? El muy famoso
Pescador. ¿Pescó peces? No, nor cierto.
Reynos y reyes, sí, ¿Con qué, mañoso?
Con ser prudente, osado y maniabierto.
¿Por qué y quién mató a aqueste valeroso?
D'embidia dél le han Marte y Muerte muerto.
Pues no les vale, no; que vence en llama
A Embidia y Marte y Muerte su gran fama.

I quote from a note in Geertruida C. Horsman's partial edition of Zapata's *Varia historia or Miscelánea* (Amsterdam, 1935). The note is on the fourth chapter of this work,⁷ "De dos galanos epitafios," of which the first is Ariosto's on Pescara, given in Latin with proper attribution, the second, also in Latin, on Vittoria Colonna, of authorship unknown to Zapata and his editor. This latter "epitaph" or, more correctly, *epigram*, has a certain fame in its own right. It too has been attributed to Ariosto, though it is evidently apocryphal.⁸ The *Miscelánea*, unpublished for some four hundred years, was probably unknown to Lope.⁹

⁵ Fol. 207v^o (Anvers [Juan Latio], 1558).

⁶ All early editions have "Nil nocuere sibi . . .," instead of Fatini's emended version. See Carducci, *loc. cit.*, p. 249.

⁷ Pp. 3-4 and 147. Punctuation is mine, here as elsewhere.

⁸ Fatini, p. 317.

⁹ The presence of the same anecdote in *La Dorotea* (p. 131, 3-6) and in the *Miscelánea* (ed. Gayangos *Memorial histórico español*, XLII] pp. 330-331) may be laid to coincidence. Lope could have found it, for instance, in A. de Torquemada's *Jardín de flores curiosas* (Bibliófilos Españoles, segunda época, XIII [Madrid, 1943], p. 62).

It is a question whether he could have known the third Spanish version of the epitaph, accompanied, like the first, by the original Latin. This is Francisco López de Zárate's, so far as I know first published in his *Obras varias* of 1651:¹⁰

¿Quién es tesoro desta piedra fría?
 El honor de la paz, paz de la guerra,
 El pescador magnánimo se encierra.
 ¿Qué pescó, cielos, qué, quando vivía?
 Reynos que a España dieron monarquías (sic).
 En que coronas le ofreció la tierra.
 ¿Y con qué redes? Con valor que atierra
 Montañas, como pechos cortesía.
 ¿Quién al mundo priuó de varón tanto?
 Las dos deidades grandes, Marte y Muerte.
 ¿Qué les movió? La Invidia tuuo parte.
 Aunque de todos ojos saca llanto,
 Él no murió, que mejoró de suerte,
 Pues ha vencido a Invidia, Muerte y Marte.

La Dorotea itself quotes a ballad of Zárate without attribution,¹¹ and as early as 1620 (*Justa poética . . . al bienaventurado San Isidro, Introducción*) Lope was lavish in praise of the young poet. The epitaph on Pescara he knows, or chooses to recall, only through Muzio. It would be illuminating to ascertain his source. His own mention in *La Dorotea*, meanwhile, is further evidence of a minor vogue for one of Ariosto's minor poems, whose success in Spain has not to my knowledge been hitherto observed.

University of California,
 Berkeley

EDWIN S. MORBY

¹⁰ Published in Alcalá. See p. 122, or José Simón Díaz's edition (Madrid, 1947), II, 135-136. It is worth pointing out that the following poem, another sonnet, was also devoted to Pescara. The influence of the Latin epitaph is manifest in it.

¹¹ P. 71, 16-18. The allusion is to "aquel romance que comienza: 'Dexóme amor de su mano,'" López de Zárate's *Romance XV*, pp. 39-40 of the Alcalá edition, and I, 362-364 of Díaz's. It should be added that Lope probably did know the original Ariosto epitaph, to judge by a sonnet (*BAE*, xxxviii, p. 378b, number 179) apparently based on it.

REVIEWS

C. L. Wrenn, ed., *Beowulf, with the Finnesburg Fragment* (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1953. 318 pp. \$4.25). THE occasion for this new edition of *Beowulf* seems to be Professor Wrenn's opinion that Klaeber's edition "will often be too formidable a book for the beginner." To me this is an astonishing idea, for though Klaeber's book contains in concise statement everything that is important for the understanding of the poem and the scholarship concerning it, it is so arranged and expressed that the student looks for what he wants, finds it and is unconscious that there is much learning packed away in it. In all the years since the appearance of Klaeber's first issue, no student has ever suggested to me that he found it heavy with learning.

Actually, much in Wrenn's Introduction is more forbidding than similar parts of Klaeber's book. For instance, nearly a page is devoted to the title of the poem, a subject which Klaeber well takes for granted. Then follow seven pages of inconclusive speculation on "textual pre-history," which surely could have little interest for a student. Next come sections on previous editions, and the text of this edition—all quite sound and of value to a scholar but of little importance to the beginner and not helpful to his understanding of the poem. The remaining fifty pages of the Introduction, treating of historical elements, the folklore, etc., seem to me less adapted to the needs of students than the treatment of those subjects in Klaeber, chiefly because they are more vague and less concise. If a simplified introduction is desirable for beginners, Sedgefield's is much better, actually briefer and yet more definite; e. g., Sedgefield is able to give the gist of Panzer's conclusions, where Wrenn gives only vague remarks on "the simple tale which is the primary plot of *Beowulf*."

Neither Klaeber nor Sedgefield makes such dubious statements as these:

Abundant imitation of [*Beowulf's*] matter and diction in such Christian heroic poetry as Cynewulf's *Elene* and *Fates of the Apostles*, and even more markedly in the anonymous *Andreas*, shows that our poem was already somewhat in the position of a 'classic' by the beginning of the ninth century (p. 9).

Similar statements may be found on page 35.

Of course, the Introduction is a valuable study of aspects of the poem; scholars will read it with interest, but beginning students will find it forbidding enough.

The text shows painstaking care, and is decidedly conservative. One innovation is the printing of uncontracted forms where meter seem to require them, instead of indicating by a circumflex or other mark that somehow one syllable functions as two. This practice seems to me quite proper and honest, whether the forms given are precisely those of the poet or not. On the other hand I can see no value in italicising every letter not now legible in the manuscript but present in Thorkelin's copies; presumably they were in the manuscript in Thorkelin's time. The only effect of this italicising is to record our debt to Thorkelin—a fact of no importance to students.

Wrenn accepts few unusual emendations. *Eorle* in line 6, which is taken to mean the Germanic tribe Eruli, is attractive, although I have never felt that emendation is necessary; it is no great assumption to suppose that *egsode* is used absolutely, "caused terror." I agree with Wrenn that in line 457 Grundtvig's emendation for *werefyhtum*, long given up, is the best emendation. It seems inconsistent to respell Weak II preterites as *-od-* but leave *-on* as the ending of some infinitives.

As far as I can judge the notes and glossary are well adapted to the needs of students. In cases of disputed interpretation they present the pros and cons simply and clearly so that one can understand the basis for Wrenn's translation of the passage, and if the student doesn't agree he can accept one of the other views.

Mechanically this edition seems to be perfect; if there are misprints in it they have eluded me.

Lenox, Massachusetts

J. R. HULBERT

Vincent F. Hooper, tr., *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales (Selected): An Interlinear Translation* (New York: Barron's Educational Series, 1948). THIS book may be welcome to the general reader. The brief introduction is good, and no one would quarrel with a selection that includes the General Prologue, the Prioress's and the Nun's Priest's Tales, the Pardoner's Prologue and Tale, the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale, the Franklin's Tale. The hasty reader will also appreciate the convenience of a line by line translation printed in

the interlineations. But the Chaucer student should be on his guard, for the mistranslations are frequent, not often likely to be recognized as such by the beginner, hence almost sure to give him some wrong idea of Chaucer's syntax, word order, morphology, etc. I shall confine myself to the Nun's Priest's Prologue (54 lines) and 120 lines of the Wife of Bath's Prologue. The italics are mine:

NPP, 1-3

(B 3957-59) "Ho!" quod the knight, "good sir, na-more of this,
 "Ho!" said the knight, "Good sir, no more of this.
 That ye han seyde is right y-nogh, y-wis,
 What you have said *is true enough, I know,*
 And mochel more, . . .
 And much more, . . .

[What can *And much more* mean unless *right enough* means *fully sufficient*?]

NPP 35-36

(B 3991-92) Wher-as a man may have noon audience,
 Whenever a man can have no audience,
 Noght helpeth it to tellen his sentence.
Nothing aids him in delivering his lecture.

NPP 50-51

(B 4006-7) "Yis, sir," quod he, "yis, host, so mote I go,
 "Yes, sir," said he, "yes, host, *so shall I proceed,*
 But I be mery, y-wis, I wol be blamed."
 Unless I am merry, *I know* I will be blamed.

WBP 349-350

For who-so wolde senge a cattes skin,
 For whoever would singe a cat's fur
 Thanne wolde the cat wel dwellen in his in.
Would have the cat live happily in his home.

WBP 361

Yet coude I make his berd, so moot I thee.
 For I could delude him, *so can I you.*

WBP 444

Is it for ye wolde have my quente allone?
 Is it that *all you want* is my tail?

WBP 464

And, after wyn, on Venus moste I thinke.
 And, after wine, *I think of Venus most.*

WBP 467

In womman vinolent is no defence
 Wine drinking in women *is no hindrance*

In other passages where the meaning is clear we are puzzled by what seems a determination to avoid Chaucer's words. Why should

NPT 388 (B 4398), "He is a cronique saufly mighte it wryte," be paraphrased as "*Without hesitancy* he might *inscribe* it in a chronicle"? Such renderings are the more surprising as the preface had announced a translation following "the original, word for word, as closely as possible, deviating from this rule only when a freer rendering clarifies what might otherwise be obscure to a modern reader."

Boulder, Colorado

GERMAINE DEMPSTER

Ernst Theodor Sehrt, *Vergebung und Gnade bei Shakespeare* (Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag, 1952. 260 pp.). PROFESSOR Sehrt's volume makes an important contribution to the History of Ideas, or more specifically to an aspect of a world-old conflict of two apparently incompatible ideas. The author shows that intermittently throughout his career Shakespeare was concerned with the conflict between law and justice on the one hand and forgiveness and mercy, on the other. He believes that the poet in showing himself in complete sympathy with the Christian conception of mercy reveals one of his fundamental ideas of man and his relation to the world in which he must live. Man is a mere "Nichtigkeit" prone to evil and in desperate need of divine mercy.

Sehrt finds forgiveness only incidental to Shakespeare's early comedies and his histories. There it is invariably dispensed by a merciful King. In *The Merchant of Venice*, the author continues, the conflict assumes much more dramatic importance and in *Measure for Measure* it becomes the crucial struggle of the entire action. In the final dramatic romances forgiveness and mercy form an essential prelude to the spiritual harmony attained by the central figures and play an important part in establishing the atmosphere of solemn joy in which the action ends.

Some of these critical pronouncements as applied to individual plays have been made before, but Professor Sehrt is the first to have traced the playwright's development of this conflict of ideas throughout his career. In carrying out his project the author has shown marked critical intelligence in his analyses of character and situation and admirable scholarly thoroughness. With a few exceptions he shows himself familiar with the important English and American works relevant to his subject.

An introductory chapter reviews conceptions in classical and mediaeval times analogous to Christian ideas of mercy—like Seneca's *clementia* or *aequitas*. In the Middle Ages he reminds us that mercy in the judicial sense of pardon was regarded as a function only of God. None of these conceptions is much like the tender humane quality with which Shakespeare deals.

Sehrt's first chapter is devoted to Henry VI, all of whose instincts lead him toward mercy and forgiveness. The mere suggestion in Halle and Holinshead that Henry never asked for vengeance or condign punishment Shakespeare expanded to create a highly original character, completely different from any figure in Marlowe or in his contemporaries and successors. This idea of the poet's originality the author further establishes in a last chapter, which might more logically have formed part of the introductory chapter. Sehrt goes on to see in Valentine's impulsive forgiveness of Proteus in the final scene of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* a new solution of the conventional love-complications of Renaissance romantic comedy. Although Shakespeare borrowed this act of lavish generosity from Boccaccio's version of the story signalling triumph of friendship over love widely debated during the 16th century, Sehrt does find significant originality in the Christian character of the form in which Valentine phrases his forgiveness:

Who by repentance is not satisfied
Is not of heaven or earth.

Portia's eloquent appeal for mercy Sehrt believes the most complete expression of the poet's own idea. It is, he explains, that embodied in the Lord's Prayer and related to the Christian doctrine of original sin. In earlier versions of the story the appeal to the Jew is of a different sort. There he is merely urged to substitute Christian "civilitie" for cruelty and reason for rigor.

Finally in *Measure for Measure* Shakespeare composes his strongest dramatic presentation of the conflict between mercy and justice and expresses his own attitude most clearly in Isabella's eloquent appeals to Angelo. In the late romances the poet restates his position, but in terms more philosophical than religious. In *Prospero*, for example, these qualities produced the serenity of a mind that has learned to see man under the semblance of eternity.

Like many historians of ideas, Sehrt, in tracing the frequent appearance of forgiveness and mercy tends to slight or to ignore the place of the ideas in the structure of the plays concerned.

Hence through Shakespeare's drawing of Henry VI Sehrt discovers that the poet betrays strong personal belief in the immanence of God's mercy. Yet it is at least equally likely that the poet's decision to make piety the essence of Henry's nature was the result of purely dramatic considerations. In II Henry VI Shakespeare had to create a weak King, so devoid of the qualities essential to a ruler that his headless Kingdom became a chaos of civil strife. Therefore Henry's devoutness was portrayed as the source of his weakness and futility. In III Henry VI, he needed a sympathetic character, for whom the audience would feel enough admiration to be overwhelmed with pity for his suffering and with terror at the deep damnation of his murder. Hence Henry develops into a kind of saint, a symbol of the peace and quiet of the religious contemplative life driven to despair and desolation by the savagery and uproar of internecine warfare. Henry's horror at the bloody courses of revenge and his cries to the Heavens for mercy and forgiveness are not necessarily utterances of Shakespeare's own deepest impulses. Their value is more likely to be dramatic than autobiographical.

Sehrt also fails to observe critical caution in his analysis of Portia's famous appeal to Shylock for mercy and of Isabella's attempt to wring from the self-righteous judge mercy for her brother. He seems to regard both of these heroines as the mouthpieces of their creator. But these scenes are both moving versions of the popular debate between justice and mercy, which was a recurrent feature of the Last Judgment play in the Mystery Circle. In the debate before God for man's soul at the hour of his death the Devil was often the prosecutor demanding strict justice while the Virgin Mary was the sinners' defender pleading for mercy. In the dramatic situations in which Portia and Isabella appear as advocates of mercy Shakespeare merely fits them into the role usually taken by Mary in the Last Judgment Plays. The effectiveness of these scenes is due not so much to Shakespeare's deep Christian feeling as to his eye for a popular and effective scene.

Even if, as this reviewer believes, Professor Sehrt's study has not revealed one of the bases of Shakespeare's philosophy, it has shown us in an interesting way the various dramatic potentialities which the poet discovered in the conflict between justice and mercy.

I have noted a few errors in Sehrt's dates for the publication of sixteenth century volumes; none of them serious. I am much more troubled by the lack of an index and a bibliography, both of which a work of as important scholarship as this deserves. Although the

author's knowledge of American scholarship in his field is wide, he seems to be unacquainted with a few books which he might have found useful. Of these S. C. Chew, *The Virtues Reconciled*, and L. Zantas, *La Renaissance du Stoicism au XVI Siècle*, might have thrown welcome light upon important aspects of his subject.

These are but slight blemishes on a fine piece of literary scholarship, cheering evidence that the splendid tradition of German Shakespeare scholarship is again vigorously alive.

Columbia University

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

Louis G. Locke, Tillotson: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Literature (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954. 187 pp. Dan. Kr. 23 [\$3.25]. *Anglistica*, 4)

THE title does not adequately suggest the scope of Prof. Locke's effort: in addition to a chapter on Tillotson's style, this study contains the first full-length portrait of the Archbishop's life since that of Thomas Birch, an analysis of Tillotson's position as Churchman and theologian, and a thorough history of his eighteenth-century reputation. Yet expectation is disappointed because our knowledge of later seventeenth-century prose is not incremented by the effort.

Straightforwardly and economically factual, the biographical chapter eschews much evocation of a personality. It is an understandable decision when one recalls the subjective effusions so common in English ecclesiastical biographies, but perhaps some compromise might have helped "pierce the obscurity which cloaks Tillotson," whose greatness appears less in his published writings than in the admiration of his contemporaries. Tillotson's relations with Isaac Barrow are somewhat inaccurately recorded (p. 28): Barrow died intestate, and his father turned over his papers to Abraham Hill and Tillotson jointly (see A. Napier, *Theological Works of Barrow* [Cambridge, 1859], I, ix-x). Incidentally, the author (p. 24) apparently adopts Birch's now untenable view that the Royal Society originated in Wilkins' Wadham College gatherings.¹

The book shows convincingly Tillotson's conscientious earnestness in seeking what he could recognize as best in and for the Anglican

¹ Cf. F. R. Johnson, "Gresham College: Precursor of the Royal Society," *JHI*, I (1940), 427-56; and R. H. Syfret, "The Origins of the Royal Society," *Notes and Records of the Royal Soc.*, v (1948), 75-137.

Establishment. It does not blink the uncomfortable conflict between Tillotson's public stand for non-resistance on the occasion of Lord Russell's participation in the Rye House Plot and his later willingness to serve as Dean and Bishop of Lambeth under new oaths to his royal friend William after the Bloodless Revolution. But the author manages to show that in every respect Tillotson placed practical moral effects above theoretical considerations, and when he concludes that Tillotson's "religious thought is dominated by practicality," that "it is the moral and not the doctrinal part of religion with which he is deeply at heart concerned" [p. 102], we are ready to transfer this principle sympathetically to his politics. Prof. Locke's judgment on the ecclesiastical statesman is sound:

The new Archbishop was qualified for his office not only by his attainments in theology and learning, but by all the vicissitudes of his life as well. Since he had been reared in a Puritan environment, he knew how to understand those who dissented from the Church; likewise, since he had scaled the ecclesiastical ladder from a humble curacy to the see of Canterbury, without the aid of aristocratic family or any other prestige, he knew the problems which confronted his subordinates (p. 53).

The description of Tillotson's religious thought is performed without reference to the intellectual impulses which surrounded him, and the author's inadequate familiarity with this milieu permits him to sweep Tillotson much too far into the vanguard of advanced thinkers on a wave of erroneous enthusiasm. Tillotson viewed "ceremonies and the other external aspects of religion" with indifference, because "it was his statesmanlike desire to divert religious energy from bickering and quarreling about the non-essentials of religion to a renewed emphasis of the great doctrines upon which there was common agreement between the Established Church and those who chose to dissent from it" (p. 79). This attitude allegedly "is so liberal that it places Tillotson's thinking several hundred years ahead of his times" (p. 80). It is true, of course, that the Establishment entertained an important group of organicist preservers of the existing liturgy; but in practice those who attributed only "decency" to Church rituals were at one with Tillotson on this point—certainly the view is found in Patrick, Glanville, Fowler and other latitudinarians, not to mention Richard Baxter. Shortly we find Prof. Locke asserting that Tillotson's statement of our necessary dependence upon the senses in his *Discourse against Transubstantiation* (1684) gives him "the honor of being the first to publish the sensationist principles of psychology"

basic in John Locke's *Essay* (p. 83). But this principle had become an intellectual commonplace much earlier, and appears with sophisticated development in Culverwel's *Elegant and Learned Discourse of the Light of Nature* (1654), in Henry More's *Brief Discourse of the True Grounds of the Certainty of Faith* (1668), and in Glanvill's essay "Of Scepticism and Certainty" (1676). Prof. Locke adopts the phrase "supernatural rationalism" from an earlier scholar to signify Tillotson's rejection of any beliefs which contradict reason, while he at the same time accepts some Christian truths as consonant with but "above" reason. Then he concludes: "From the historical point of view, Tillotson's supernatural rationalism is important because, as McGiffert says, 'He set the fashion for nearly all Christian thinkers that came after him for a number of generations'" (p. 109). But S. L. Bethell a few years ago pointed out that this relationship between natural religion known through "reason" and revealed truths was so far from being unique that it placed Tillotson in a pattern of Anglican orthodoxy which had been stated repeatedly since Hooker opened the way (*The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* [London, 1951], pp. 13-37, esp. pp. 16-7, 33, which treat of Tillotson). Citing William Law as its chief spokesman, Prof. Locke would see eighteenth-century evangelism as a reaction created by the energy Tillotson released: "Thus it appears that the rationalism of Tillotson led, through intermediate stages, . . . and by way of reaction, to the great evangelical revival" (p. 111). A spiritual evangelism almost identical with that of Law, of course, had swept England in the mid-seventeenth century with the rise of those First Publishers of Truth who created Quakerism; and Law was even more dependent upon the works of that yet earlier reformer, Jacob Boehme, than were the Quakers themselves. Tillotson has little relevance here. Finding that the charge was a persistent thorn in the Anglican's side, we need not give up quite so easily as to conclude with Prof. Locke that, his friendship with Firmin aside, "It is difficult to discover any valid reason for the imputation of Socinianism to Archbishop Tillotson" (p. 93). Whatever its doctrinal skeleton, Socinianism meant a number of other things to the period, and if we notice that *The Charge of Socinianism Against Dr. Tillotson* (p. 13) claims that "his religion is latitudinarian," which means that it "ridicules whatever is called supernatural; it reduces God to matter and religion to nature," we may see that the theologically-motivated adaption of the new atomism by latitudinarian Anglicans goes far to explain why Tillotson, their

highest-placed spokesman, was a "Socinian" to unsympathetic critics. Terminology reflects the looseness of thought: "Puritan" and "Calvinist" now seem different things (p. 17), now the same (pp. 19, 20). Nor was Benjamin Whichcote a "Neo-Platonist" (p. 35, n. 60).

The analysis of Tillotson's style flounders. Prof. Locke finds it marked by plainness, simplicity, polish, and brevity—the marks of a modern prose born in Tillotson's time, of which he himself was "the chief popularizer and diffuser" (p. 130). George Williamson's monumental analysis in *The Senecan Amble*² should not only have laid the ghost of the notion that "ascribes chief importance to the Royal Society" in the birth of plain prose (Prof. Locke says this notion represents "the latest trend of scholarship" and "must be accepted" [p. 113]), but might have suggested that "brevity"—"remarkable ability to state briefly a rather large idea" in Prof. Locke's book—is scarcely a characteristic mark of late-century prose which is breaking the bonds of Senecan pithiness. The author feels the difficulties; seeing no way to talk about "plainness" except by contrast, he cites a body of uncharacteristic passages which mark Tillotson's vestigial use of the older rhetorical prose. We get classical allusions, a grand example of baroque style (p. 123), and a "character" embedded in a sermon. The brief selection of "homely" images would fare better if the comparison of schoolmen to spiders which Tillotson "perhaps recollected from his youth in a quiet Yorkshire village" (p. 118) were not a loud echo of Bacon's analogy (*Nov. Org.*, 1st Bk. of Aphorisms, xciv). When we have finished, we realize that Tillotson's "plain" prose is a complex structure, but we have no notion of why the eighteenth century singled out "The Incomparable Tillotson" from other practitioners of the plain style, and placed him with Shakespeare and Milton for nearly a century after his death. That this was the case, Prof. Locke demonstrates beyond doubt with a broad documentation of the Archbishop's reputation from school grammar texts and periodical criticism spanning the century. Aside from the failure to formally analyse Tillotson's "plainness," the author has made little attempt to discover its origins or specific effects. He mentions Tillotson's work on Wilkins' *Essay Towards a Real Character*, but does not

² A bibliographical note to the style chapter refers to Williamson's adumbration of this book is an early essay, but omits notice of the full-scale study. Two of Croll's group of essays on the subject are not mentioned, and one is located in a journal where it did not appear. Jones' essays on scientific and pulpit prose reform are not mentioned here or in the discussion, although one of them turns up in the bibliography.

discuss it in relation to style; nor does he mention Tillotson's flagrant stylistic "improving" of Barrow's sermons (see Napier, *Works of Barrow*, I, xiii-xv). Birch followed Burnet in relating Tillotson's style to Wilkins' *Essay*, and Williamson (*Senecan Amble*, pp. 272, 348) has been instructive in denying their point; Tillotson's literary revaluator might have acknowledged the problem. Both the exhortatory purple passages in Tillotson (p. 70) and his admission that his sermons are "loose and full of words" because "so I think the style of popular sermons ought to be" (p. 122) are phenomena explained on psychological grounds in Joseph Glanvill's contemporary manual for Anglican pulpits, *An Essay Concerning Preaching* (1678).

Washington University

JACKSON I. COPE

Clarence Tracy, *The Artificial Bastard: A Biography of Richard Savage* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1953. xvii + 164 pp. \$4.50). MR. Tracy provides what has long been needed, a scholarly, factual life of Richard Savage. Neither sentimental nor overly skeptical, he avoids fictional techniques and rigidly holds to what can be proved. He is partial to his subject, but does not distort meanings or twist facts to prove his contentions. Thus the portrait which emerges is probably very close to the real man.

Readers who have assumed that Savage was merely a dissolute imposter will be astonished to find Mr. Tracy suggesting that Savage's claims may have had some validity. Indeed, the case against him appears even less convincing than his own romantic tale. In the end, Mr. Tracy tends to agree with Johnson about Savage's character: though not wholly admirable, "he was not a vicious fraud, and may have told the truth."

In assembling the evidence, Mr. Tracy has consulted early biographies, court records, newspaper accounts, all of Savage's published works, and manuscript letters in the British Museum. Since so few of Savage's letters have survived it is to be regretted that more direct quotations were not included from those in the Birch collection. Not that they are remarkable letters, but even short notes are valuable in showing style and manner.

In general Mr. Tracy's research has been admirable, and it may appear ungenerous to wish for more. But there is always the lingering suspicion that a thorough combing of manuscript collections in England might have turned up additional material. Even in the

British Museum Mr. Tracy, as had all before him, missed a copy of an important letter from Pope to Savage (recently published by Mr. Edward Ruhe in *RES* for April 1954). It is quite possible that hidden somewhere is still more evidence which would modify the picture.

One difficulty with the biography is that Mr. Tracy has apparently been unable to decide as to the nature of his audience. While obviously determined on a scholarly approach, he adopts a flamboyant title to appeal to the general reader and normalizes to modern practice some of the quotations. Yet throughout he is inconsistent, and nowhere states specifically what his policy is. For example, on page 119 a passage from a letter to Birch is rendered exactly, with "ye" and "w^{ch}" and "y^t" retained. On the other hand, on page 131 another transcript from the same correspondence has been normalized: contractions have been expanded and spellings modernized, though eccentric capitalization has been retained. In this instance a reproduction of the original letter as an illustration shows clearly just what has been done. There is no indication what procedure has been followed in quotations from newspapers and periodicals.

Some readers will be disappointed that so little new could be discovered about the relations of Savage and Johnson. Yet this reviewer has no right to complain since he too has searched in vain for more details. Perhaps we shall never know when the two men met, or how. All that Mr. Tracy can say is that it was sometime "in 1737 or 1738." But to allow the former year means ignoring the specific statement of Johnson to the Rev. John Hussey that he had not met Savage before completing the poem *London*, which was published in May 1738 (*Life*, I, 533). If Hussey is to be believed on this point, and it appears likely that he should be, then 1737 must be eliminated. But such a minor difference of opinion need not be belabored. Until someone comes along with further major discoveries, Mr. Tracy's book will remain the standard authority on Richard Savage.

Columbia University

JAMES L. CLIFFORD

M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1953. xiii + 406 pp. \$7.50). IT would be difficult to exaggerate the debt which the study of Romanticism owes to Irving Babbitt and A. O.

Lovejoy. Though for divergent purposes, they placed it securely in its appropriate setting in the history of ideas; and underlying Babbitt's polemic was a lively sense that the effects of the Romantic movement were still working themselves out in the thought and literature of our own century. These virtues reappear in the work of Dr. Abrams, who carries something of Lovejoy's method into a systematic examination of the theory of poetry, and who writes with Babbitt's sense of contemporary issues, though entirely without his sometimes disabling polemic.

The Mirror and the Lamp adds, however, another dimension in its clear recognition of the role of metaphor in critical thinking and in the answers returned to the questions, "What is poetry, and what its function and justification?" Two of the basic metaphors are identified in the title, the "one comparing the mind to a reflector of external objects, the other to a radiant projector which makes a contribution to the objects it perceives." Both are examined in some detail, as are other metaphors hardly less important—for example, the metaphor of organic growth applied to poetry and to the individual poem. But the enquiry as a whole is rather pervaded by a sense of dominant metaphors than confined to their exposition. As the subtitle indicates, it is concerned with the whole Romantic theory of poetry and its relation to the critical tradition, first of the preceding, and then of the following periods. Beside the matters which can be brought directly under the metaphors mentioned above, the book treats at length of the increasing emphasis upon emotion ("the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings") and, linked thereto, the "expressive theory of poetry" in which the poem becomes above all else a "revelation of personality."

With its precise and extensive references *The Mirror and the Lamp* furnishes what amounts to a check-list of the principal English documents bearing on its subjects, adding to the sources used by earlier investigators others, too much neglected, such as Keble's *Lectures on Poetry*; and by its copious and well-chosen quotations it provides something like a classified anthology of Romantic opinions. Nor does it restrict itself to the English field, but examines the classical sources of the critical tradition and supplements its account of Neoclassicism by references to French critics, and of emergent Romantic theories by a fuller reference to German.

This last set of references constitutes for the English reader one of the most valuable features of the work. And here, it may be re-

marked, Dr. Abrams comes closer than at some other points to fulfilling the promise of the Preface, "to trace the origins of prominent romantic ideas . . . in philosophy" and other fields of thought, when he convincingly relates the German development of the metaphor of the poet as creator to the metaphysics of Leibniz or recognizes in Kant a potent influence on the formation of other theories. For few English critics, save Coleridge, does he make the background in speculation anything like so clear.

Indeed, the book would have benefited greatly by a fuller and firmer account of the currents and counter-currents of English thought from Bacon and Hobbes until, with Coleridge, the German tributary flowed in, opposing the main current of Empiricism but reinforcing the counter-currents already present. The fuller and firmer account would have set several facts in clearer, and some in rather different, perspective. It would have enabled us to see more distinctly the relation between the Empirical view of mind and the tendency of English Neoclassicism (in so far as it responded to this view) to adopt the metaphor of the mirror as Dr. Abrams defines it, namely, as connoting an imitation of empirical reality, something very different from the imitation of nature as conceived by either Aristotle or Coleridge. It would have raised the question whether a principal difference between the Hobbesian and the Coleridgean poetic did not turn on the facts that Hobbes's reason or "judgment" was roughly identical with Coleridge's "understanding," and his undifferentiated imagination and fancy with Coleridge's "fancy," while Coleridge's "reason" and "imagination" betokened powers completely unrecognized by Hobbes. It would have given Dr. Abrams the opportunity to supplement his illuminating account of the Benthamite depreciation of poetry by exhibiting it as the outcome of an evaluation already plainly adumbrated by Bacon and acquiesced in by many of the Pre-Romantics. And it would have guarded the reader against a too simple identification of English Neoclassicism with the Empirical outlook, and of both with a "mechanical" theory of art, in reaction against which Romanticism produced its "organic" theory of unconscious growth. Here, a part of the difficulty seems to lie in the ambiguity of the terms "mechanical" and "organic." For (as a matter of fact) Empiricism had this as one of its important results: it transferred to the "mechanical" operation of association processes which traditional criticism had assigned to purpose and

the conscious exercise of invention and judgment, thus in measure paralleling the transfer to be effected by the "organic" theory.

Admirable in many respects as is Dr. Abrams's treatment of Coleridge (and nowhere more so than in his recognition of the centrality of the famous passage on the "primary" and the "secondary" imagination, which commentators have so often brushed aside), it throws, if not too much emphasis on the concept of organism, at least an emphasis that requires to be balanced by one of equal weight on Coleridge's view of mind, two of the pivotal terms in the vast effort of synthesis which constitutes the essentially religious philosophy of Coleridge. Again, in his discussion of Wordsworth, Dr. Abrams seems to me, if not to overestimate the retention of Empirical elements in his later position, at least to underestimate the significance of the lines in the *Prelude* (Book 14) which identify imagination with "reason in her most exalted mood," and the degree to which they complete the poet's earlier sense of perception as itself a creative activity, of the mind as lamp and not simply as mirror.

Dr. Abrams's treatment of his subject by topics has the great advantage of following each one through to its conclusion. The topics are so numerous and so well chosen as to catch most, if not quite all, of the relevant phenomena (Burke on the Sublime, to take one example, slips through the net with only a passing reference to his theory of language); but in general the thoroughness of the coverage is remarkable, and the skilful arrangement yields to the reader a steady increase of illumination from the first to the last page. One result, however, is unavoidable, despite some repetition and numerous cross-references—namely, the fragmentation of the account of individual figures; and even the excellent index does not quite solve the problem of reassembly. To me the most cogent illustration is my own uncertainty whether, in the slight disagreement with Dr. Abrams on Coleridge and Wordsworth voiced above, I have been quite correct in my interpretation of his views if everything that he says on these subjects were brought together.

But let me not end on a note of hesitation. *The Mirror and the Lamp* is marked by wide learning, mature critical judgment, and great skill in exposition. It presents an extraordinarily fresh and stimulating attack upon its subject and it abounds in new insights. I can think of no work on Romanticism, since Babbitt and Lovejoy blazed their new trails, which surpasses it in originality and interest.

University of Toronto

A. S. P. WOODHOUSE

Kathleen Coburn, ed., *The Letters of Sara Hutchinson* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1954. xxxviii + 474 pp. \$6.00).

THIS carefully edited volume supports the proposition that if old letters are kept long enough someone is likely to publish them. The present collection contains 168 items written between 1800 and 1835. A superb index offers the reader a rich prospect; most of the famous names of the period are represented (notable exceptions include Jane Austen, William Blake, and Shelley). The letters, however, are disappointing, consisting as they do in too great part of trivial domestic chitchat and descriptions of the weather.

Sara Hutchinson is memorable primarily because of her connections with Coleridge and the Wordsworths, in whose household she lived much of the time for thirty years. In 1799, after he had been married long enough to discover that his wife left something to be desired intellectually, Coleridge met Sara Hutchinson and fell in love with her. The affair reached a literary climax the night of 4 April 1802 when Coleridge, in physical and domestic misery, addressed to Sara the misshapen first draft of the poem now known as "Dejection: An Ode." When Wordsworth answered "Dejection" with "Resolution and Independence," Sara wrote the Wordsworths a letter in which she criticized the latter poem adversely, probably causing its radical revision. This letter unfortunately is not extant, and none of those here published illuminate these or any other literary matters of major importance. Some of them, however, raise the question as to whether Sara Hutchinson had any intellectual personality of her own worth mentioning. Such of her views on current affairs as these letters express usually echo the opinions of those around her, and one fears that the caliber of her literary taste and judgment is indicated only too clearly by this comment on *Endymion* (1818):

Little Keats too I see is in the publishing line—but the Title of his Poem has no charms for me—however beautiful it may be I am sure it cannot awaken my interest or sympathies—I wonder anybody should take such subjects now-a-days.

This is not to say that Sara and her letters are altogether lacking in attractiveness. Sara Hutchinson was a warm, cheerful, and obliging person. An inveterate knitter of socks for cousins, nephews, and friends, she could be counted upon always in time of need, whether as baby tender or advisor to young men frustrated in love. No one understood better the digestive processes of the Wordsworth children (Willy in particular found an enemy in raw apples), and no one

else has described so amusingly the chimneys of Allan Bank whose formidable belchings of smoke almost drove the Wordsworths from Grasmere in 1808. These letters are full of intimate odds and ends that friends and relatives delight to receive but that posterity need feel little obligation to re-examine.

Newcomb College,
Tulane University

GEORGE W. MEYER

Josephine Bauer, *The London Magazine, 1820-29* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1953. 362 pp. Anglistica, 1). AFTER reading this study, few would question the assertion that *The London* "remains one of the most distinguished publications in the history of the press." "Our Elia," no doubt, was the pride of the magazine, but Hazlitt developed his *Table Talk*, a number of his best essays, and some of his best dramatic and art criticism in its pages; and De Quincey first published his *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* there. It was in *The London*, too, that Landor published his first imaginary conversation and that Carlyle and De Quincey did much to arouse interest in contemporary German thought and literature. And there were, of course, other lesser luminaries: Thomas Hood, Hartley Coleridge, Henry Francis Cary the translator of Dante, John Hamilton Reynolds the friend of Keats, Thomas Noon Talfourd an early champion of Wordsworth and first biographer of Lamb, John Clare the peasant poet, George Darley, Barry Cornwall, Allan Cunningham, and Bernard Barton the Quaker poet—to name some of the other contributors. And above all there was John Scott, the ill-fated first editor who set the tone of the magazine not only during the fourteen months that he mapped its course and determined its policies but whose influence lingered on during the editorship of his successor, John Taylor (1821-25).

It is not unexpected, therefore, that Miss Bauer should make an emphatic claim for the role which *The London* played during the 1820's. In delineating this role Miss Bauer first sketches the social and political background and then, in order to enable the reader to see *The London* against a proper backdrop, gives brief accounts of several contemporary periodicals. Turning to *The London* itself, she sets forth the principal facts in the life of the magazine and then proceeds to look closely at its contents (especially during the editor-

ships of Scott and Taylor) under such headings as Belles Lettres, Criticism of Contemporary Literature, Revaluation of Early English Literature, Continental Literature, Drama, Music, and the Fine Arts.

One of Miss Bauer's most important achievements is the contribution which she makes to a full understanding of John Scott. Indeed, it is really Scott rather than *The London Magazine* itself or its distinguished supporting contributors that is the hero of Miss Bauer's study. Whether or not he was the editor or the writer or the man that Miss Bauer believes that he was (and partly shows him to have been), certainly she makes it clear that he was a man of real quality and of greater stature than has hitherto been generally recognized.

Convincing on the whole, too, is Miss Bauer's identification of *The London* with every forward-looking movement in art and social life during the 1820's, as well as her emphasis on its role of pioneering in the field of independent reviewing, importing and giving popularity to foreign literatures, stimulating interest in romantic Hellenism and in the Elizabethans, and uttering remarkably unerring critical judgments.

All this and more makes Miss Bauer's book rewarding reading. Yet one cannot but regret that it possesses to an imperfect degree one quality so desirable in such a study. I refer to the skill which enables one to give extensive summary—such as the present study does—and at the same time keep background, detail, and broad synthesis so well balanced and so artfully synchronized that the reader is constantly aware of the exact relationship of the part to the whole and the whole to the part. Thus, in the opinion of this reader, Miss Bauer's book would have been strengthened if much of Part One—the social, political, and periodical press background—had been woven into Part Two so that the significance of *The London's* achievements might be seen in sharper focus. Again, in addition to analyzing some aspects of many, many articles (and this is done very well indeed) the author might profitably have done more to digest and formulate and state the guiding principles and philosophy of criticism that motivated *The Londoners*.

Here and there are to be found some typographical errors and errors of detail. Most of these are at worst mildly disconcerting, but a few are serious (e. g., p. 331, where 1807 is given as the date of the founding of the *Edinburgh Review*; p. 289 and p. 292, where Carlyle's interest in Goethe is traced to his study at the University of Edinburgh and "Schiller" is stated to have been his first publication).

Such lapses, however, do not really impair the value or the usefulness of Miss Bauer's study. The volume should be read by all those who are interested in periodicals or in the 1820's and should convince them—if they need convincing—that a study of the periodical literature of the past is a rewarding way of gaining insight into a bygone age.

University of Kentucky

WILLIAM S. WARD

Nathan Comfort Starr, *King Arthur Today: The Arthurian Legend in English and American Literature, 1901-1953* (Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1954. xvii + 218 pp. \$3.50 paper, \$4.50 cloth). MOST readers, although aware of occasional echoes of the Arthurian legend in contemporary literature, will be surprised at the variety and vitality of the recent retellings and adaptations that are described in Professor Starr's compact but readable account.

A chapter called "Prelude" covers the years 1901-1916, when the legend was treated mainly by "uninspired beneficiaries of the Victorian momentum"; some of whom, nevertheless, by their attempts at psychological realism pointed the way for later and better writers. Of these forerunners, Ernest Rhys was the most devoted and prolific, Lawrence Binyon (in his dramatic ode *The Death of Tristram*) and Martha Kinross (in her tragedy *Tristram and Isolt*) the most gifted.

The rest of the book is arranged topically. "An Old World Newly Doomed," "The Tragedy of Cornwall," and "The Spirtual Land of Logres" are respecticely concerned with the three traditionally dominant lines of action: the Lancelot-Guinevere-Arthur triangle and its many ramifications, the baffled passion of Tristram and Isolt, and the fateful return to earth of the Holy Grail. Other chapters are "Dux Bellorum," describing attempts to recover, from behind Malory's medieval pageantry, the "historical" Arthur engaged in primitive warfare against the invading Saxons; "The Comedy of Camelot," devoted to satirical or light-hearted treatments of the legend; and "The Seer of Caledon and Camelot," dealing with works in which Merlin is a central rather than subsidiary character. A supplemental bibliography offers the reader a bird's-eye view of the field.

Despite its brevity and the multiplicity of titles mentioned, Mr. Starr's book is far more than a descriptive catalogue. The intention is primarily critical—if it is permissible nowadays to apply that term

to a work which largely eschews analysis of form and concerns itself with humane values. From this point of view, the comments are always perceptive, without laying claim to unique profundity. (They are phrased, one may add, with the kind of care that is considerate of the reader.) The writers who appear to be held in highest regard by the author are E. A. Robinson, John Masefield, T. H. White, Charles Williams, and C. S. Lewis. It is notable that these men, however free or even whimsical their treatment of the legend, always aim at some measure of "truth and high seriousness." On the other hand, Mr. Starr finds relatively little to praise in such clever but eccentric or superficial satires as James Branch Cabell's *Jurgen* and John Erskine's *Galahad*.

One may wish that the study had been extended to include explicit comment on such general topics as the sources of the legend's continuing appeal and the problems which confront the 20th century writer who responds to it. Clearly the renewed vigor of the legend since 1917, revealed especially in the novel (Robinson's poems are essentially verse novels), springs from recognition of the fact that the stories must be not merely retold but re-created, in an idiom, intellectual as well as verbal, which strikes us as natural and appropriate to our own age. This usually involves one of two approaches, each with its own danger. To modernize the characters and their problems, while leaving the setting ostensibly remote (Robinson is the most notable example of this dominant tendency) is to run the risk of anachronism, even though the basic themes of the legend are timeless and unchanging. On the other hand, to make the story modern in all respects and then to identify the conflict and some of the key characters with those of the old legend (as Williams and Lewis do in *War in Heaven* and *That Hideous Strength*), involves resort to either the supernatural or the allegorical, and both are currently out of fashion. For this reason some persons will revise downward Mr. Starr's high estimate of Williams's work.

These and similar topics are surely relevant to a study of "King Arthur Today." Within the limits that he set himself, however, Mr. Starr has done his work well.

University of Chicago

ELLSWORTH BARNARD

Harry Hayden Clark, ed., *Transitions in American Literary History* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke Univ. Press, 1953. xiv + 479 pp. \$6.00). THIS unique symposium, prepared for presentation at the 1948 annual meeting of the Modern Language Association, attempts to fill a succession of assumed gaps in our record of American literary history. Mr. Clark planned the series of papers and apparently assigned the topics. His idea, as stated in his Preface, was to explore the periods between periods, when the rise or decline of literary movements might best be traced. The result is an uneven succession of papers starting with the systematic and informative account of the weaknesses in the Puritan system and their consequences, by Clarence H. Faust. This high level is maintained in Leon Howard's analysis of the complex of political, ethical, and literary ideas and trends at the close of the eighteenth century and achieved once again in Alexander Kern's clear and definitive account of the rise of Transcendentalism.

The rest of the book is not so successful. The paired chapters on neoclassicism vs. romanticism fail because they lack shared and well-rooted definitions of the terms under discussion. Mr. Heiser becomes confused by spreading his net too widely; Mr. Orians remains too much on the surface of his problem; neither chapter comes to grips with the basic issues involved. The final paired chapters on romantic idealism vs. realism come nearer to joining an issue. Too much of Mr. Stovall's analysis is given to retelling the story of the rise of sentimentalism in the novel and of native humor, but he succeeds in providing a springboard for Mr. Falk's more original and provocative study of the nature and causes of the realistic movement in America against the background of the European movement.

On the whole, this book succeeds in offering enough new thinking about old problems to fulfill its object of provoking further research in areas that need it.

University of Pennsylvania

ROBERT E. SPILLER

Roger Asselineau, *The Literary Reputation of Mark Twain from 1910 to 1950: A Critical Essay and a Bibliography* (Paris: Marcel Didier, 1954. 240 pp.). THIS bibliographical study belongs to a very useful genre and is excellent of its kind. In an introductory essay of 57 pages Mr. Asselineau points out the stages through which Mark

Twain's reputation has passed since 1910. At the time of his death, only a few critics (William Dean Howells, Brander Matthews, William Lyon Phelps) were willing to acknowledge that he was a major writer. The A. B. Paine biography, published in 1912, was passionately adulatory, but served mainly to establish a legendary Mark Twain as "the champion of the American way of life against the European." This tendency was accentuated by the feverish nationalism of the period of the First World War. Mark Twain was thus identified with nearly everything that the Young Intellectuals of the 1920's opposed, and was obviously a prime target for "debunking." At the same time, "the temptation was great to make [him] an honorary member of the Lost Generation." Van Wyck Brooks's *The Ordeal of Mark Twain* somewhat paradoxically performed both these operations—extolling an imaginary Mark Twain, the rebellious satirist who might have been, but attacking the actual Mark Twain as a failure. Mr. Asselineau traces the development of these ideas from Brooks's *America's Coming-of-Age* (1915) to Waldo Frank's *Our America* (1919), back to Brooks's *Ordeal* (1920), and thence into the work of the many disciples of Brooks in the following decade. He notes that the thesis of an American society made sterile and obscurantist by big business lent itself readily to development by the Marxists of the 1930's—by V. F. Calverton and Granville Hicks, for example—who accepted Brooks's interpretation of Mark Twain but gave it a strong political emphasis.

Mr. Asselineau neatly analyzes the issues raised by Bernard DeVoto's attack on Brooks in *Mark Twain's America* (1932), and describes with restrained amusement the sectional pieties that led Minnie M. Brashear to make Mark Twain a son of Missouri, Ivan Benson and Effie M. Mack to claim him for the Far West, and Kenneth Andrews to naturalize him in New England. The final phase, "The Rehabilitation of Mark Twain, or Mark Twain as a Literary Artist," is foreshadowed in the 1920's by articles insisting on Mark Twain's wide reading, continues in Miss Brashear's study in 1934, and progresses through Edward Wagenknecht's *Mark Twain—the Man and His Work* (1935), DeVoto's *Mark Twain at Work* (1942) and DeLancey Ferguson's *Mark Twain, Man and Legend* (1943) to what Mr. Asselineau considers a climax in Edgar M. Branch's *The Literary Apprenticeship of Mark Twain* (1950) and especially Gladys C. Bellamy's *Mark Twain as a Literary Artist*, published in the same year. Mr. Asselineau overestimates the amount of analytical criticism in Miss Bellamy's book, but the critical bent of current Mark Twain studies is unmistakable,

and Miss Bellamy's competent summary of Mark Twain criticism does provide a platform upon which a genuinely critical interpretation can be built.

The remainder of this monograph consists of a bibliography listing more than 1300 items of Mark Twain scholarship and criticism, with comment on the more important items. The material is arranged by years, with a topical division within each year into Bibliographies, Biographies and Books of Criticism, Introductions and Prefaces, Other Books Dealing with Mark Twain, Periodical Literature, and Unpublished Theses. In addition to his announced purpose of covering the years 1910-1950, Mr. Asselineau lists 28 items published in Europe before 1910, and 65 items from both sides of the Atlantic for the years 1951-1952. An index of names provides easy access to the contributions of any given writer. The list is selective rather than complete, but the selection is intelligently made, and in reading it through I have not been reminded of any important items that are omitted. Fulbright and Smith-Mundt grants enabled Mr. Asselineau to work for a year in American libraries (especially Widener); he has gone carefully through all the obvious checklists and some that are far from obvious. Scholars interested in Mark Twain will long be grateful for this admirable manual—the more grateful, perhaps, because it comes from a country that has been rather slow to show an interest in Mark Twain. Since the compiler has urbanely chosen to use the English language throughout, he will readily be pardoned a number of typographical errors, most of which are noted on an errata sheet.

University of California,
Berkeley

HENRY NASH SMITH

F. T. H. Fletcher, *Pascal and the Mystical Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. vi + 156 pp. 25s.). MR. Fletcher relates the conspicuous intensity of Pascal's faith to the mystical tradition. His endeavor is well informed and well written. His aim is significantly broadened by the inclusion within the mystical tradition of poets and thinkers whose experiences were not specifically Christian.

Thus, Mr. Fletcher broaches a psychological and aesthetic subject. His study is not confined to theology or to a phenomenology of faith. Yet, at no time is the self-evident authenticity of Pascal's experience diminished by the relationships Mr. Fletcher uncovers; rather do they deepen the meaningfulness of the apologist's position. Among others,

the parallel between Pascal's conception of the three orders and that of Balzac in *Louis Lambert* is provocative.

The author avoids the usual pitfall of like studies: that of influences. His conclusions are the richer since he posits no rare source for Pascal's faith. He merely associates each phase of Pascal's mystical life to that evinced by others, be they Suso, Boehme, St. Paul, Hugo or Wordsworth. In this manner, he obviously enhances the substance and breadth of Pascal's literary message.

This message, as Mr. Fletcher proves, is unique. Its quality lies in expressing a vision of peculiar intensity through ordinary language. Pascal's originality is singled out as the reconstruction in logical terms of a super-rational pilgrimage.

In particular, the author points to the value of the *Mémorial* within the body of mystical literature. He makes the explication of the *Mémorial* the live center of his study. Perhaps he makes it too much so. Specifically, this reviewer cannot receive Mr. Fletcher's interpretation of the line "Eternellement en joie pour un jour d'exercices [sic] sur la terre" to mean "that Pascal had spent the whole day preceding his religious experience in prayer and meditation" (p. 24, p. 117). It would seem safer to interpret Pascal's line in the more obvious though figurative meaning of life being but as a day's trial before the joy of eternal peace.

Other points of difference briefly follow. Mr. Fletcher, who accepts without discussion the *Discours sur les passions de l'amour* as Pascal's, doesn't warn the reader that such is not the opinion of most Pascalian today (p. 64, p. 141). Certainly, the author must be aware that Tourneur's aversion for mysticism was only paralleled by his distaste for Sorbonne professors (p. 11)! Doesn't the author exaggerate the pre-Reformationist in Pascal (ch. VII)? And should we not bear in mind that Pascal's vision of Creation is necessarily that of a scientist? Because Pascal does not espouse the poet's view of Creation, Mr. Fletcher has a tendency to deny him a keen feeling for the organic unity of the universe (p. 143).

However that may be, Pascal's mark in mystical thought, the logical expression of the super-rational, fully entitles Mr. Fletcher to classify him among "extrovert mystics who consummate their religious experience by sharing it" (p. 109). Hence, the author considers him as an ambivert, one who resolves a synthesis between inward life and the preoccupation for humanity's fate. No doubt, the term ambivert lacks nobility. Mr. Fletcher compensates for its pedantic crudity by

the perceptiveness of his interpretation. He is convincing when he has us regard Pascal as an initiate into the "ordre de charité."

Duke University

J.-J. DEMOREST

Samuel Rogers, *Balzac and the Novel* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1953. 206 pp.).

MR. Rogers has attempted here to present a broad framework of *La Comédie humaine* "that may serve as a context into which the reader can fit the particular novels and stories he happens to know" (p. viii). If Mr. Rogers had done nothing but sort the plots and label the characters, his modest goal might have been met. Instead, to a forest of names, places, and quotations, he has added some bright spots of criticism and analysis which, while refreshing as such, do not suit his immediate purpose and leave the reader with a spotty and incoherent picture both of Balzac's work and of Mr. Rogers's intentions. Indeed, what Mr. Rogers says of Balzac is often true here: "The reader must force his way at times through cluttered and obscure trails" (p. 146).

The author shows well how Balzac's novels reveal his own involvement in the social and economic life of his times; how Balzac was influenced by the mysticism of Boehme and Swedenborg; and how his attitude to his characters is "a vast sympathy" that neither accuses nor excuses. On this last point Mr. Rogers develops a clever analogy between the irony of Balzac and that of Flaubert. He shows us a Homais and an Arnoux depending on the manipulations of their creator and who, if Flaubert's irony were to waver, would disappear. And then we have a Vautrin or a Goriot who, like the streets and houses of Balzac, "seem to exist in themselves independent of the lighting" (p. 131). And he counters the critics who dismiss plot as a regrettable necessity by emphasizing Balzac's concern with the life and movement of his people.

Quite correctly, Mr. Rogers attacks François Mauriac *et al.* for stressing a coherence and "inflexibility" in Balzac's characters. Grandet's avarice is not, says Rogers, a distinct entity. It is, all at once, the thrift of the peasant, the eagerness of the collector, the lust for power and, too, the product of an ironic game he likes to play. One feels, though, that Mauriac is a weak opponent to involve in a debate of this sort since his saints and sinners are so obviously and inevitably moulded by the singleness of their virtue and vice. Granted

that Balzac's characters are many-sided and cannot be analyzed à la Mauriac, but Mr. Rogers belabors the obvious too long here and in too negative a way. What one would like to have seen developed is just what makes Balzac unique as a novelist; how it was that he transformed personal experience and energy into the creatures of his fiction; and how the synthetic or panoramic vision of the *Comédie humaine* (and Rogers insists on "a panorama rather than a progress") compares, say, with the chronological treatment of a Romaine or a Martin du Gard or the retrospective technique of a Proust.

One is disturbed, too, by the occasional muddled constructions (i.e., the reference to Taine and Gautier "neither of whom can be said to have had no feeling for language" [p. 141]); and, less often, by such axiomatic judgments as: "The greatest difference between living people and fictional characters . . . is simply that the former exist in real time and place, the latter do not" (p. 135).

In all, Mr. Rogers has much that is interesting and even important to say. But he has tried to do too much in too many directions and in too short a space. The result is a book that will, in parts at least, excite the scholar. However, for the layman—for whom it was presumably intended—it provides, ironically enough, a context that is both loose and "inflexible" and which touches but does not enclose the vast panorama of *La Comédie humaine*.

The Johns Hopkins University

JAMES C. McLAREN

Milman Parry and Albert Lord, *Serbocroatian Heroic Songs* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. Vol. I. Novi Pazar: English Translations. xvi + 479 pp. \$12.50. Folding map. Vol. II. Novi Pazar: Serbocroatian Texts. xxxi + 448 pp. \$7.50). Leopold Haupt and J. E. Schmalzer, *Volkslieder der Sorben in der Ober- und Nieder-Lausitz* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1953. [ii] + x + 392, viii + 332 pp. Folding map, 5 plates. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Volkskunde, 3). Stavro Skendi, *Albanian and South Slavic Oral Epic Poetry* (Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1954. viii + 221 pp. \$3.50. *Memoirs of American Folklore Society*, 44). Margaret Dean-Smith, *A Guide to English Folk Song Collections, 1822-1952* (Liverpool: Liverpool Univ. Press, 1954. 120 pp. 15s). Jonas Balys, *Lithuanian Narrative Folksongs* (Chicago: Draugas Press, 1954. 144 pp. \$3.50. *Treasury of Lithuanian Folklore*, 4). Iivar Kemp-

pinen, *The Ballad of Lady Isabel and the False Knight* (Helsinki: Kirja-Mono OY. 301 pp.). Paul G. Brewster, *The Two Sisters* (Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1953. 101 pp. 300 Finnish marks. FF Communications, 147). THESE seven books are examples of characteristic tasks in the study of folksong. There are two collections (Parry and Lord, Haugt and Schmalzer), a regional survey (Skendi), two lists (Margaret Dean-Smith, Balys), and two investigations of Child ballads (Kemppinen, Brewster). Milman Parry and Albert Lord's generous collection from the living Serbo-croatian epic tradition is particularly important because rather few of these songs have been available to English readers and even Serbian scholars have known comparatively little about the Moslem Serbian tradition of Novi Pazar. Collections from four other centers of Serbo-croatian song are planned to follow. The collectors have used modern techniques of recording and add an abundance of information about the singers. They have reproduced the songs as fully and as accurately as can be hoped for. In the two volumes, there is, however, only one musical text. The editorial apparatus includes remarks on the historical backgrounds of the songs, the citation of parallels from Parry and Lord's manuscripts and printed collections, and critical and interpretative comments with the comparison of versions. There is, finally, an index of proper names as well as a map of Yugoslavia as it was in 1935, when Parry made his first visit. There is no index of formulas and themes, but this may be reserved for a later volume.

Parry and Lord have intended to offer "documents . . . of an oral tradition which in turn will illuminate other traditions." This means more specifically that Parry hoped to throw light on the origin and development of the Homeric epics by studying a living heroic tradition. Students of the Homeric epics have been restricted almost entirely to inferences that might be drawn from linguistic, metrical, stylistic, historical, and archaeological evidence obtained by critical study of the texts. These two volumes contain only the materials that are to be used in a new attack on the problem of epic origins. Lord's promised volume *The Singer of Tales* will put them to use. In addition to a critical study of the texts and a comparison with a living modern tradition, a third method of attack consists in the investigation of versions belonging to different developmental stages. This method is applicable to many Germanic heroic songs and especially to the *Nibelungenlied*. A comparison of these three methods and their results would be very illuminating.

The admirable anastatic reprint of Haupt and Schmalzer's classical collection (Grimma, 1841) of Wendish songs and folklore makes available once more a book that has long been entirely out of reach. Even today one can learn something about editorial technique from it. Note the very interesting tabulations (I, 318-323; II, 303-306) of epic formulas and realia of all kinds. Although F. J. Child offered a somewhat similar index in his *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, later editors have not always been equally generous and helpful. The comparative and interpretative notes are surprisingly rich for the time when the book was written. It is virtually a compendium of Wendish folklore that includes proverbs, customs, tales, superstitions, and mythological fragments as well as songs. Since the Wends have preserved both a Germanic and a Slavic tradition, this collection contains texts of rare usefulness and importance.

Skendi's regional survey of two traditions of oral epic poetry involves much discussion of Serbocroatian texts and often supplements Parry and Lord's collection. It is unfortunate that the two books could not have been connected by cross-references, for variations in the titles of songs and the lack of an index to Skendi's book make it difficult to pass from one to the other. After bibliographical surveys of Serbian and Albanian collections (pp. 1-22) and a historical review of early allusions to Serbian and Albanian song (pp. 24-33), Skendi describes historically and critically many songs in the two languages. He would have succeeded much better in this task, if he had put Albanian song first and had clearly subordinated the Serbian material. Chapter III, entitled "Old and Balkan Cycles" (pp. 34-56), shows the difficulty that he has in riding two horses at once. The significance of the chapter title does not appear in the discussion. The chapter begins with comment on localization in Serbian (pp. 34-35) and Albanian (pp. 35-36) song, and continues with an account of the Albanian Scanderbeg (pp. 36-39), who is contrasted with the Serbian Marko Kraljević (pp. 39-40). Skendi then rejects the theory of an origin of the Serbian songs in monasteries in favor of an origin at market fairs (pp. 40-41) and returns to the contrast of Marko and Scanderbeg (pp. 41-43). He then discusses the dissemination of the Serbian songs (pp. 43-44), contrasts the two heroes once more (pp. 44-45), and takes up theories of the influence of the chansons de geste (pp. 45-46) and the Greek songs of Digenis Akritas (pp. 46-48) on Serbian and Albanian song. This leads into discussion (pp. 48-56) of some widely known Balkan songs that have nothing to do with Scanderbeg and

Marko. Had Skendi made such an outline as would be required of a student in freshman composition or had he made an index, he would have seen the need for a more careful organization. There is a great abundance of useful information in his book, but one cannot get at it easily.

Bibliographical aids have not been very numerous in the field of folksong, but are now being made in ever-growing numbers. There are, for example, A. K. Davis's list of Virginia songs, T. P. Coffin's list of traditional ballads current in America, and G. M. Laws's list of American songs. The most recent example of a list is Margaret Dean-Smith's *Guide*, made on the same plan as her *Index of English Songs* in the *Journal of the [English] Folk Song Society* and its continuation. The *Guide* gives in convenient form the contents of more than sixty English collections. American collections are not included, nor are those made in the British Isles outside England. One joins Gerald Abraham, the author of the "Foreword," in regretting that the compiler did not make an exception and include the book of the English collectors, Cecil Sharp and Maud Karpeles, *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians* (2d ed., 2 v., Oxford, 1932). This contains songs "that were found in England imperfect, mutilated, incomplete" (*Guide*, p. 23). Like the *Index*, the *Guide* is an invaluable aid in finding tunes, titles, variant titles, and first lines. The discussion of Herder, communal origins, and carols in the "Foreword" somewhat exceeds the purpose of the *Guide*.

Jonas Balys, former archivist of the national Lithuanian folklore collection, offers a handy summary of more than three hundred types, representing several thousand texts, of Lithuanian narrative songs. This work greatly facilitates the study of international connections. Balys is generous with references to parallels in Slavic languages, except Bulgarian. Would S. Romanski, *Pregled na bulgarskrite narodnyia pesni* (Sofia, 1925, 1929. Copy in the Library of Congress) have filled this gap? For western Europe Balys has used freely Eric Seemann's important "Deutsch-litauische Volksliedbeziehungen," *Jahrbuch für Volksforschung*, VIII (1951), 142-211. This is cited in a note on p. 15, but not in the bibliography. I call attention to the following references to Child ballads: Nos. 2 (Balys, A 31), 4 (Balys, C 16, C 18), 10 (Balys, G 7), 21 (Balys, C 4), 44 (Balys, F 55), 50 and 52 (Balys, J 9), 51 (Balys, C 2), 87 (Balys, C 6), 95 (Balys, A 72), and 194 (Balys, C 81). Balys also gives references to Sharp and Karpeles. His comments on communal origins, criticisms

of Louise Pound, discussion of theories of the medieval origins of balladry are not pertinent to his purpose and are too brief to justify themselves.

Kemppinen's investigation of Lady Isabel and the Elf Knight (Child, No. 4) raises many questions and will for a long time be a key book for the further study of this important ballad. This example of the Finnish method is based on no fewer than 1865 versions! Kemppinen maintains that the false knight is a "nocturnal rider" (p. 211), whose musical skill persuaded the girl to accompany him (p. 214). I cannot, however, see that the evidence supports this description of the knight beyond all question. These details are essential to his further argument that the name Halewijn, which is characteristic of Dutch and Flemish versions, can be connected with the *mesnie Hellequin*, a name for the Wild Hunt. From this basis he goes on to cite other demons and traditionally malevolent figures and especially Lemminkäinen in the *Kalevala*. This discussion needs to be tied more closely to the ballad. Kemppinen reviews and rejects earlier explanations of the ballad. He does not make altogether clear how the various redactions that he points out are historically related. Kemppinen's abundant materials and shrewd observations call for further critical study.

Brewster's concise and neatly organized investigation of The Two Sisters (Child, No. 10) comes to the conclusion that the ballad originally ended with the resuscitation of the murdered sister. He believes that the ballad was a Norwegian invention that was carried to the Faeroes and Iceland, Scotland, and (in another version) to England. The English and Scottish versions were subsequently contaminated. The American versions were ordinarily derived from English, not Scottish tradition. Brewster has handled the difficult task of exposition with great skill.

University of California,
Berkeley

ARCHER TAYLOR

EN
A
Crit
Yorl
\$8.0
Bo
and
more
Bo
tuell
Univ
\$2.50
Mod
Ca
Idées
(Pub
l'Uni
Ch
Sazo
Heffe
Ch
York
\$5.75
Del
II, ec
bridg
\$7.50
Don
Legou
Fal
Parod
1955.
Fri
I: P
shall
Almq
Kr.
Englis
Fro
Trans
1955.
Englis
Hal
(Sydn
1955.

May,

BOOKS RECEIVED

ENGLISH

Allen, G. W., *The Solitary Singer: A Critical Biography of Walt Whitman* (New York: Macmillan, 1955. xvi + 616 pp. \$8.00. Illustrated)

Bede, *A History of the English Church and People*, tr. Leo Sherley-Price (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1955. 341 pp. 85¢)

Bonno, Gabriel, *Les Relations intellectuelles de Locke avec la France* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1955. vi + 277 pp. \$2.50. Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 38, no. 2)

Cazamian, Madeleine L., *Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre, 1860-1914*, Vol. III (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1955. 495 pp.)

Chadwick, H. M., *The Study of Anglo-Saxon* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, England: Heffer, 1955. xvii + 99 pp. 6s.)

Clifford, J. L., *Young Sam Johnson* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955. xv + 377 pp. \$5.75. Illustrated)

Dekker, Thomas, *Dramatic Works*, Vol. II, ed. Fredson Bowers (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1955. vii + 592 pp. \$7.50)

Donne, John, *Poèmes choisis*, tr. Pierre Legouis (Paris: F. Aubier, 1955. 224 pp.)

Falk, R. P., ed., *American Literature in Parody* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1955. 279 pp. \$3.75. Illustrated)

Fristedt, S. L., *The Wycliffe Bible, Part I: Principal Problems Connected with Forshall and Madden's Edition* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1953. xvi + 148 pp. Kr. 18. Plates. Stockholm Studies in English, 4)

Frost, William, *Dryden and the Art of Translation* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1955. xi + 100 pp. \$3.50. Yale Studies in English, 128)

Hall, R. A., Jr., *Hands Off Pidgin English* (Sydney, Australia: Pacific Publications, 1955. 142 pp. \$2.00)

Kirschbaum, Leo, *Shakespeare and The Stationers* (Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press, 1955. x + 421 pp.)

Kökeritz, Helge, *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation* (New Haven: Whitlock's, 1955. 32 pp. \$1.00. With recording [\$3.75] of "Selections from Beowulf" read by John C. Pope, and "Selections from Chaucer" read by Kökeritz)

König, Erich, *Edward Young* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1954. 130 pp. 8.50 S. Fr. Swiss Studies in English, 37)

Meyer, G. D., *The Scientific Lady in England, 1650-1760* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1955. xii + 126 pp. \$1.50, paper; \$2.25, cloth)

Nicoll, Allardyce, ed., *Shakespeare Survey 8* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1955. viii + 172 pp. \$3.75. Plates)

Quintana, Ricardo, *Swift: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955. viii + 204 pp. \$4.25)

Randolph, Vance, ed., *The Devil's Pretty Daughter and Other Ozark Folk Tales* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1955. xvi + 239 pp. \$3.75. Illustrated)

Richards, R. F., ed., *Concise Dictionary of American Literature* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. vii + 253 pp. \$5.00)

Sledd, J. H., and Kolb, Gwin J., *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955. viii + 256 pp. \$5.00)

University of Texas, *Studies in English* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1954. 118 pp. \$1.00. Vol. 33)

Zandvoort, R. W., *Collected Papers* (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1954. viii + 186 pp. Florins 7.90. Groningen Studies in English, 5)

GERMAN

Baumgarten, A. G., *Reflections on Poetry*, tr. K. Aschenbrenner and W. B. Holther (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1954. x + 90 + 40 pp. \$3.50. Facsimiles)

Clark, R. T., Jr., *Herder: His Life and Thought* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1955. xii + 501 pp. \$6.50)

Hesse, H., and Rolland, R., *Hermann Hesse / Romain Rolland Briefe* (Zürich: Fretz & Wasmuth Verlag, 1954. 118 pp. 19 M.)

Hofmannsthal, H. von, *Selected Essays*, ed. Mary E. Gilbert (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. xxxvii + 158 pp. Blackwell's German Texts)

Maurer, Friedrich, *Die politischen Lieder Walthers von der Vogelweide* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1954. viii + 136 pp. DM. 14)

—, *Die Lieder Walthers von der Vogelweide unter Beifügung erhaltener und erschlossener Melodien*, I. Bändchen, *Die religiösen und die politischen Lieder*. (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1955. 96 pp. Altdeutsche Textbibliothek Nr. 43)

Novalis, F., *Three Works*, ed. Brian A. Rowley (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1955. ix + 99 pp. 75¢ Cambridge Plain Texts)

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Frame, D. M., *Montaignes Discovery of Man* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1955. viii + 202 pp. \$3.50)

Griffith, G. T., *Bandello's Fiction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. 147 pp.)

Isopescu, Claude, *De la langue et de la littérature roumaine en Allemagne* (Freiburg: Biblioteca Romana, 1953. 36 pp.)

—, *Il Diplomatico studioso americano E. Schuyler e i Romeni* (Freiburg: Biblioteca Romana, 1954. 58 pp.)

—, *Le Poète Américain Edwarg King et ses Inspirations Roumaines* (Freiburg: Biblioteca Romana, 1954. 30 pp.)

Penna, Mario, ed., *Arçipreste de Talavera* (Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1952. 248 pp.)

Peyre, Henri, *The Contemporary French Novel* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955. 363 pp.)

Politzer, Frieda and Robert, *Romance Trends in 7th and 8th Century Latin Documents* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1953. 68 pp.)

Queirazza, G. G., S. J., ed., *La Chanson de Roland* (Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier, 1952. 385 pp.)

Turnbull, Eleanor L., ed. and tr., *7th Centuries of Spanish Poetry*, intro. by Pedro Salinas (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1955. xv + 452 pp. \$5.00)

Vega, Lope de, *El Príncipe Despeñado*, ed. Henry W. Hoge (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1955. 183 pp.)

Weinberg, Kurt, *Henri Heine "Romantique Défroqué"* *Héraut du symbolisme français* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1954. 303 pp.)

MISCELLANEOUS

Herrick, M. T., *Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development in Italy, France, and England* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1955. vii + 331 pp. \$4.00, paper; \$5.00, cloth. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 39)

Macdonald, Margaret, ed., *Philosophy and Analysis* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. viii + 296 pp. \$7.50)

Passage, C. E., *Dostoevski the Adapter: A Study in Dostoevski's Use of The Tale of Hoffmann* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1954. x + 203 pp. Univ. of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature, 10)

Pedersen, Holger, et al., *Lingua Posnaniensis: Revue de Philologie Comparée et de Linguistique Générale*, Vol. I (Poznan: Univ. of Poznan, 1949. iii + 371 pp.)

Spitzer, Leo, *Critica Stilistica e Storia del Linguaggio* (Bari: Laterza, 1954. 366 pp.)

Trawick, B. B., *World Literature*, Vol. II: *Italian, French, Spanish, German, and Russian Literature since 1300* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1955. ix + 373 pp. \$1.75 College Outline Series, 93)

Turgenev, Ivan, *Rudin*, ed. Galina Sisman (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1955. 264 pp. \$3.50)

Wandruszka, Mario, *Haltung und Gebilde der Romanen* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1954. 100 pp.)

Young, J. I., tr., *The Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson* (Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1954. 131 pp. 10s. 6d.)

, Ten
Pedro
Press,

to, ed
diana

omaw
plisme
Press,

Origin
, and
Press,
\$5.00,
e and

y and
al Li-

apter:
Tala
North
niv. d
re Lib-

Pome
arée a
OZMAR:
)

Storia
A. 385

ol. II:
d Ruc
York:
\$1.75

a Stil
Press,

edard
emeyu

lde of
wen k

Notes

Tr., 7m
y Pelm
s Prem

ado, el
Indian

Roma
abolism
Prem

Orig
ce, an
is Prem
; \$5.00
age an

phy m
ical L

Adapt
he Tale
of Nati
Univ. d
tive Li

Pom
paris d
Pomna
pp.)
e Stor
54. 00

Vol. II
nd Re
York
p. \$1.75

na S
Prem

Geddi
Sieme

Edda
Powe

e N

THE FINER TONE

KEATS' MAJOR POEMS

By EARL R. WASSERMAN

Mr. Wasserman's perceptive reading of the poems combines an intimate knowledge of Keats' works, including his letters, with the most rewarding and salutary approaches that have been developed in recent criticism. Texts of five of the poems—*Ode on a Grecian Urn*, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *Lamia*, and *Ode to a Nightingale*—are included.

"The sensitive and perceptive studies that make up [this book] are almost a model of the way in which the explication-of-the-text method should be applied to one of the great Romantic Poets." — W. J. Bate.

1953

236 pp.

\$4.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND



JAMES C. McLAREN



THE THEATRE OF ANDRÉ GIDE

Evolution of a Moral Philosopher

This first complete study of Gide's theatre considers his plays and dialogues as psychological documents which reveal more accurately than any other genre the succeeding phases of his development as moral philosopher and esthetician.

The dramatic form is naturally suited to an externalization of Gide's moral conflict, and the protagonists of his theatre represent the participants in a constantly changing inner dialogue of moral extremes.

1953

127 pages

\$3.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Of all of Gide's works the perfect choice for early classroom reading is

La Symphonie pastorale



It is short, the language is simple, the story is of irresistible interest to young people. The introduction and notes facilitate both literary appreciation and perception into Gide's more profound intents in dealing with this particular theme. Complete end vocabulary. 155 pages (69 pages of text).

Paper. \$1.25

Edited by JUSTIN O'BRIEN
and M. SHACKLETON

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York 14
Atlanta 2 Dallas 1

Chicago 16 San Francisco 5
Home Office: Boston 16

THE HARMONIOUS VISION

by DON CAMERON ALLEN

One of the central poetic topics that engaged the imagination of John Milton was that of the vision given to man when he had put his own inner music in harmony with that of God. In *THE HARMONIOUS VISION* this theme becomes an important means of explicating some of Milton's poetry and of understanding his artistic intent.

As Allen leads the reader through Milton's poetry, he shows the twin development of Milton as a poet, and of the idea of the "harmonious vision" in the poetry itself.

In the Fall, the harmonious vision is lost, but it can be won again. Towards its recapture, Milton, true son of Eve, expended the full powers of his poetic life.

The book comprises six essays, written in a scholarly yet engaging style. In this new reading of the great poet, Don Cameron Allen has produced a book which the publishers believe will be of utmost importance to Miltonists, and all serious students of poetry.

146 pages

Index

\$3.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND